



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2007

No. 23

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Reverend Kenn Hucks, Pastor, Immanuel Baptist Church, Lebanon, Tennessee, offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we offer to You our greatest praise and thanksgiving for another day to serve You and our fellow man. Thank You for the grace and blessing to live in this great land.

Grant to every American in this great assembly a craving for Your wisdom, the courage to express it, and the commitment to never turn away from what is right.

Bring true and lasting peace to our world. Allow spiritual renewal to sweep our great land, and help us to truly become one Nation under God that is indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

Help each of us to humble ourselves under Your mighty hand and truly love our neighbor as our self.

Protect our Armed Forces, prosper our workforce, and prescribe the path of Your will for all of America and for every American. In our Savior's name, amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HILL led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### WELCOMING THE REVEREND KENN HUCKS

(Mr. COOPER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COOPER. Madam Speaker, we were privileged today to have deliver our opening prayer the Reverend Kenn Hucks from Lebanon, Tennessee, Immanuel Baptist Church, formerly in BART GORDON's district, and now in my district. We are also privileged to have his beautiful wife Kim with us today sitting in the family gallery.

This is a church that started in 1947 with just a few dozen members, and now it is in the top 1 percent of the Tennessee Baptist and the Southern Baptist Conventions, due to a long line of inspirational pastors, the latest of whom is Kenn Hucks, who joined the congregation, was called to the ministry in 2002. We appreciate his great spiritual leadership in our community, and we appreciate his being with us today.

### BUSH BUDGET

(Mr. KLEIN of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I would like to speak about the budget this morning and the concern that I have that the budget President Bush has proposed makes it very clear that his priorities are out of touch with everyday Americans. President Bush would rather maintain his tax cuts for the wealthiest in our communities, while leaving seniors, veterans and working families behind.

He also believes that his budget will rid our Nation of debt in 5 years, even though he wants to keep spending billions of dollars in Iraq and maintain these tax cuts for the most wealthy.

Further, President Bush continuously fails to be up front with the American people about the true cost of

the war. Even in the supplemental that he proposed, he fails to acknowledge the additional cost of the troops and support personnel that will be required by the troop surge. Folks, the numbers simply don't add up.

I am disappointed that the budget fails to include ample funding for the Everglades restoration and beach renourishment, which are an important asset and resource in our country. The Everglades and our beaches in Florida are not only important to Floridians, but also national treasures enjoyed by millions of Americans each year.

It is time for our government to step up to the plate and fulfill its commitment to the Everglades, our beaches, and all our other natural assets; I am going to fight to make this happen.

President Bush's priorities are out of step, and as we continue to debate his budget, I am confident Congress will restore funding to many of the programs our American families deserve and depend on.

### ELIMINATING PREVENTABLE HEALTH CARE ASSOCIATED INFECTIONS

(Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIM MURPHY OF Pennsylvania. I would like to welcome my colleague from Pittsburgh in his first time in the Speaker's chair.

Mr. Speaker, more people die each year from infections they pick up in hospitals than from AIDS, breast cancer or auto accidents. The Centers for Disease Control reports these health care-associated infections contribute to 90,000 deaths per year, with annual costs exceeding \$50 billion. Medicare costs for patients who contract an infection while hospitalized is five times higher than for patients without these infections. For Medicaid patients, costs are 14 times higher.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1275

Many hospitals have dramatically reduced infection rates by implementing patient safety procedures. I will be introducing the Healthy Hospitals Act to provide financial incentives to hospitals for savings gained from eliminating these infections, and require public reporting of infections so health care providers and patients can work together to save lives and money. We need patient-centered health care that promotes patient choice, patient safety and patient care quality.

To learn more about eliminating preventable health care-associated infections, I invite my colleagues to visit my Web site at [Murphy.house.gov](http://Murphy.house.gov).

#### PRESIDENT'S BUDGET CONTINUES TO SHORTCHANGE VETERANS AND MILITARY RETIREES

(Mr. WILSON of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we have an obligation as a government to provide assistance to the men and women who have bravely served our Nation in our military; but once again, President Bush sent us a budget this week that significantly shortchanges veterans health care.

While our brave troops are fighting abroad as of right now, the President proposes a \$3.5 billion cut in veterans health care over the next 5 years. His budget also provides less than veteran service organizations say is needed to meet the growing needs of veterans, including the fact that we have a growing robust amount of veterans with the Iraq-Afghanistan war.

For the fifth year in a row, the budget raises health care costs on 1.3 million veterans, imposing \$4.9 million in increased copayments on prescription drugs, and new enrollment fees on veterans over the next 10 years.

The budget also increases TRICARE health care premiums for the Nation's military retirees, and includes several other changes in military health care that have been rejected by Congress in previous years.

If these proposals are not successful during the 2008 fiscal year, the budget for military health care will continue to be underfunded by at least \$1.8 billion.

Mr. Speaker, America's veterans deserve better, and they will get it from this Democratic House.

#### CAMERAS IN THE SUPREME COURT

(Mr. POE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court is the most powerful Court in the world. These nine black-robed individuals rule on constitutional matters that affect all Americans for lifetimes. The third branch of government holds its session in public, as it ought to be.

The theory behind public court proceedings is that the more public and

open, the more likely they are to be fair. More courts throughout the vastness of America are expanding on this public trial concept by allowing unobtrusive cameras in the courtroom. This allows citizens to view court proceedings. When I was a judge in Texas, I allowed cameras to film criminal trials, including a capital murder case. I found that this enhanced the concept of a fair public trial.

Those that have never been a trial lawyer or a trial judge say that lawyers play to the cameras; but lawyers don't play to the cameras, they play to the jury or the court.

So open Supreme Court proceedings to cameras. Let America see what takes place. And to those judges who are opposed to this openness, maybe they shouldn't be doing what they do when the camera is not rolling.

And that's just the way it is.

#### KUCINICH 12-POINT PLAN FOR IRAQ

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, we are sacrificing our entire domestic agenda for an illegal war in Iraq.

When you look at the President's budget, reductions in education and health care over a period of time will cause many necessary programs to be cut for the American people. Meanwhile, the White House is discussing whether or not to bring refugees from Iraq to the United States.

Now, think about it a minute. We are prosecuting an illegal war in Iraq, we are illegally occupying the country, we are building permanent bases in Iraq, and now we are talking about bringing refugees here. The real humanitarian thing to do would be to end the war by ending the occupation, closing the bases and bringing our troops home.

That is exactly what my 12-point plan would do. I reached it with the help of people from the international community, the U.N., people who have experience in peacekeeping. They say we can bring in an international security force once we get agreement from the countries in the region, and we can bring our troops home.

We have to stop this disaster in Iraq, bring our troops home, end the occupation.

#### CONGRESSIONAL INACTION JEOPARDIZES WALLOWA COUNTY ROADS, RESCUE SERVICES AND PILT

(Mr. WALDEN of Oregon asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the failure of Congress to reauthorize the Secure Rural Schools and Communities Self-Determination Act amounts to another breach of faith to

more than 600 forested counties and 4,400 school districts across our great country.

For Wallowa County, Oregon, this means the road department and the sheriff search and rescue budgets will be slashed in half. There are more than 700 miles of roads in Wallowa County maintained by a current staff of 14. Soon only seven will try and keep up with this responsibility; that is one person for every 100 miles of road in Wallowa County. That is the same distance as between Washington, DC, and Richmond, Virginia. County Commissioner Mike Hayward says, "Impact to our roads and rescue services will put our citizens and visitors at risk."

Loss of the county payments program will also have a significant negative impact on more than 18 county governments across America whose Payment in Lieu of Taxes funds could be reduced by as much as 20 percent.

This Congress must keep the Federal Government's word to the people who live in timbered communities and pass H.R. 17. Time is running out for them.

#### BUSH SLASHING FUNDING TO EDUCATION AND JOB TRAINING PROGRAMS IN 2008 BUDGET

(Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, the President's budget serves as a blueprint as to what his priorities will be for the upcoming year.

At a time when our economy is becoming increasingly competitive, it is essential that we fully fund education programs across the board. Unfortunately, education is not prioritized in the President's budget.

Funding for No Child Left Behind remains about \$15 billion below the level promised when the bill was first signed into law in 2001. How can we hold our schools accountable when the President refuses to provide the funds needed to improve many of these schools?

The President finally makes good on a 6-year-old promise to increase the amount of money given to low-income students through the Pell Grant program, but it comes at a price. The President proposes recalling all Perkins loans and eliminating nine other higher education assistance programs.

At a time when college is becoming more out of reach for many Americans, we should be looking to strengthen all college assistance programs so more high school seniors have a chance to attend.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats, this one included, will once again make education a priority for our Nation's students.

#### AFGHANISTAN

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to stress the importance today of our partnership with the people of Afghanistan.

The 9/11 attacks were planned in Afghanistan, and a number of those who planned it are still at large, including Osama bin Laden. President Hamid Karzai's leadership is vital, as is his continuing work to bring stability and security to Afghanistan; he is an important ally in the global war on terrorism. Unfortunately, reports suggest that progress in Afghanistan continues to be undermined by Taliban and terrorist forces operating out of Pakistan.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow Afghanistan to become a failed state again; therefore, we must ensure that terrorist operations in Afghanistan stop and terrorist sanctuaries and safe havens across the border in Pakistan are eliminated. And we need more cooperation from Pakistan. Let's not neglect the situation in Afghanistan. We do so at our peril.

#### BUSH ADMINISTRATION NOT PREPARED TO SEND TROOPS TO IRAQ WITH PROPER SUPPLIES

(Mr. SARBANES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, as we know, President Bush wants to send another 22,000 young American men and women into harm's way in Iraq in the face of overwhelming opposition, even within his own party and his own administration. Now we are learning that the military does not have all the equipment needed to safely send these troops to Iraq. The Washington Post reported last week that the increase in troop levels will create major logistical hurdles for the Army and Marine Corps, which are short thousands of vehicles, armor kits and other equipment. Even the Army's Deputy Chief of Staff for Force Development said, "We don't have the armor kits and we don't have the trucks," and it will take months for the Army to obtain the necessary supplies.

This is simply one more piece of evidence that the administration's proposal to increase troops in Iraq is terribly misguided. It is another example of how the rhetoric of supporting the troops is not matched by the reality.

□ 1015

#### FORMER BORDER PATROL AGENTS IGNACIO RAMOS AND JOSE COMPEAN

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, you know, we are discussing national security every single day on the floor of this House, and our Border Patrol agents seem to be the forgotten sol-

diers fighting this war on terror. They guard our border every single day and protect our country from terrorists, from human traffickers, from drug traffickers.

Former Border Patrol agents Ignacio Ramos and Jose Compean were recently convicted of shooting a drug smuggler while they were patrolling and protecting the border. Then they were sentenced to a decade in prison. You may have read that our own U.S. Attorney had this drug smuggler brought from Mexico, gave him immunity to testify against our agents, and then the smuggler was released.

Now the drug smuggler is suing the U.S. Government for damages. As soon as Agent Ramos began his sentence in a Federal prison, he was assaulted by drug smugglers and drug users who were inmates in that prison. Ramos was doing his duty, protecting Americans from the thugs and the drug smugglers. Now we have failed to protect him.

#### BUSH WANTS TO MAKE TAX CUTS FOR WEALTHY PERMANENT WHILE INCREASING TAXES ON 30 MILLION

(Mr. BUTTERFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, last month during his State of the Union message, President Bush said that it is possible to balance the budget without raising taxes, but that is not the case. The President's health care proposal would increase taxes on more than 30 million Americans.

You didn't hear that during the State of the Union address, but the President wants to tax Americans who have what he calls gold-plated health coverage. The overwhelming majority of these Americans are middle class workers who oftentimes accepted better health care coverage over pay increases during negotiations with their employers. Many of these workers either need the substantial coverage for themselves or a sick family member.

The President's tax increase proposal is the latest assault on employer-provided health care. Employers with older and sicker workers pay higher insurance premiums, not because they have gold-plated insurance, but because their insurance companies charge them for more coverage. At a time when 1 million more Americans are becoming uninsured every year, the administration should not provide employers another reason to drop their health care coverage for their workers.

#### HOPE SHINES AFTER THE DISASTER

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, this weekend, a deadly tornado inflicted

enormous damage in my Congressional district. Yet even in the darkest times, the victims of the storm were enveloped in the incredible generosity of its neighbors. By Saturday, over 1,400 volunteers provided 22,000 meals and snacks and distributed 1,000 health kits.

Tim Miller and his three sons helped the Suggs family gather their belongings after the storm left. Tim Miller said, "I'm just doing what I can to help."

Villages resident Al Seiden said, "Despite our house being destroyed . . . if you look around, there are at least eight people, volunteers, friends and neighbors who have come in and helped us . . . The spirit of this community is unbelievable."

Wendy Spencer, the COE of the Governor's Commission on Volunteerism adds, "We are receiving so many offers to help, which is wonderful. Our goal is to maximize this generosity to be as effective as it can be for meeting the needs of the tornado survivors now and in the weeks and months to come."

Congratulations to all these volunteers. Great job.

#### AMERICAN HEART MONTH

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge American Heart Month, which is observed each year throughout February. I anticipate that many of my colleagues will attend events in their districts commemorating Heart Month, as I will.

As we do, I urge all of us to pay special attention to the effects of heart disease on women. The good news is that heart disease deaths are beginning to decline among women.

The bad news remains, however, that heart disease is still the number one killer of women in this country. Although awareness among women about their risks for heart disease is increasing, awareness remains particularly low among minority women.

Let's take the opportunity during American Heart Month to talk with the women in our lives and in our community about their risks for heart disease and the preventive steps they can take to decrease these risks.

#### SUPPORT THE METHAMPHETAMINE REMEDIATION RESEARCH ACT OF 2007

(Mr. WALZ of Minnesota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 365, the Methamphetamine Remediation Research Act of 2007. In Minnesota, methamphetamine usage has increased dramatically over the past decade. With that being said, legislators, law

enforcement and concerned citizens are all taking the necessary steps to protect our communities from the threat of methamphetamine usage and production.

This legislation addresses the difficult problem of meth lab remediation. Meth production, which occurs most often in residential homes, leaves behind dangerous toxic waste. In fact, according to the Minnesota Department of Health, meth production leaves behind up to 7 pounds of dangerous chemical waste for every pound of meth produced. This waste presents a health risk to future residents and an environmental risk to the surrounding area.

In 2005, in Minnesota, 88 major meth labs were discovered, each of which presented significant risk. Although Minnesota has strong local and State guidelines for dealing with meth lab remediation, the Federal Government can still play an important role in making our communities safer.

H.R. 365 will direct the EPA to research and establish important voluntary guidelines for meth lab remediation. Furthermore, the bill will bring together local and State agencies, organizations and individuals to share their best strategies for cleaning up meth labs and determining when they are inhabitable.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is a necessary step toward improving the meth lab remediation process nationwide. It will help local, State and Federal law enforcement safely move forward after discovering a meth lab, and it will make local communities dealing with the methamphetamine problem cleaner and healthier. I encourage its passage.

#### AMERICAN HEART MONTH

(Ms. BORDALLO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, February marks the 44th annual American Heart Month, an effort to raise awareness of the single largest cause of death for both men and women in this country, heart disease. Like the country as a whole, heart disease is the leading cause of death on my island of Guam.

However, heart disease is increasingly becoming an issue for Pacific Islander women. In fact, a recent Centers for Disease Control study indicates that heart disease is responsible for 214 deaths per 100,000 women on Guam. This is a staggering rate, and only through greater awareness and education can we begin to confront this challenge.

I urge everyone, Mr. Speaker, to take this opportunity to battle this disease by educating others about the benefits of healthy living and the risk factors contributing to heart disease.

#### NEW NATIONAL SECURITY ESTIMATE SHOWS THAT THERE IS NO MILITARY SOLUTION IN IRAQ

(Mr. PERLMUTTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, last week, the White House received a new National Intelligence Estimate from our intelligence agencies that confirms what we already know: The situation in Iraq is bad and likely to get worse. The NIE report concluded that the U.S. has little control over the day-to-day developments in Iraq and that there is a strong possibility of further deterioration.

The report also refutes the President's claim that we could begin to see progress from his troop escalation within the next 6 months. Instead, the President's own intelligence experts expressed deep doubts that the Iraqis will be able to gain any real control over their militias within the next 18 months.

They also stressed that the major security problem is not the presence of al Qaeda but instead is the Iraqi-on-Iraqi violence. The intelligence officials make clear that the political accommodations are crucial to reducing sectarian tensions, but the report concludes that the parties are unwilling or unable to make them at this point.

#### ADMINISTRATION DOESN'T HAVE ENOUGH SUPPLIES FOR TROOP ESCALATION PLAN

(Mr. SIRES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, as President Bush moves forward with his unpopular plan to send an additional 22,000 troops to Iraq, it is crucial that this Congress take a hard look at how this surge affects our national security throughout the rest of the world.

Last week, General James Conway, the Marine Corps Commandant, told the House Armed Services Committee that if troops were needed somewhere else in the world, the response would be a lot slower than we might like. Army Chief of Staff Peter Schoomaker went as far as saying that pooling resources for troops in Iraq limits our ability to respond to emerging strategic contingencies.

Mr. Speaker, after hearing all these warnings from military officials about the President's escalation plan, Congress must step in and voice its opposition in the name of protecting our national security. The days of rubber stamping the President's war plans are over.

#### STIFLING IRAQ DEBATE IN SENATE

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, democracy is based on the free exchange of

ideas, debating issues to find a solution reasonable people can agree upon. However, when it comes to discussing the most important issue facing our Nation, the Senate Republican leadership is more concerned with giving the President political cover than engaging in a democratic debate of ideas.

The Republican Senate leadership is even blocking the voices in their own party by filibustering debate on any resolution dealing with the war in Iraq, including the McCain-Graham resolution supporting the President's troop surge and the Warner-Levin resolution in opposition to it. The consideration of these resolutions, especially the bipartisan Warner-Levin resolution, would serve as the basis for the first real debate on the President's flawed Iraq war policy since the war began nearly 4 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve a democratic discussion of ideas on the issue that is most important to them. Next week we will have a debate here in the House that will allow each of us to speak our minds on the President's plan, and I would hope that the Senate leadership would allow the same debate over in the other Chamber.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOYLE). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Recorded votes on postponed questions will be taken later today.

#### METHAMPHETAMINE REMEDIATION RESEARCH ACT OF 2007

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 365) to provide for a research program for remediation of closed methamphetamine production laboratories, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 365

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Methamphetamine Remediation Research Act of 2007".

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) Methamphetamine use and production is growing rapidly throughout the United States.

(2) Materials and residues remaining from the production of methamphetamine pose novel environmental problems in locations where methamphetamine laboratories have been closed.

(3) There has been little standardization of measures for determining when the site of a closed methamphetamine laboratory has been successfully remediated.

(4) Initial cleanup actions are generally limited to removal of hazardous substances and contaminated materials that pose an immediate threat to public health or the environment. It is not uncommon for significant levels of contamination to be found throughout residential structures after a methamphetamine laboratory has closed, partially because of a lack of knowledge of how to achieve an effective cleanup.

(5) Data on methamphetamine laboratory-related contaminants of concern are very limited, and cleanup standards do not currently exist. In addition, procedures for sampling and analysis of contaminants need to be researched and developed.

(6) Many States are struggling with establishing remediation guidelines and programs to address the rapidly expanding number of methamphetamine laboratories being closed each year.

### SEC. 3. VOLUNTARY GUIDELINES.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT OF VOLUNTARY GUIDELINES.**—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (in this Act referred to as the “Administrator”), in consultation with the National Institute of Standards and Technology, shall establish voluntary guidelines, based on the best currently available scientific knowledge, for the remediation of former methamphetamine laboratories, including guidelines regarding preliminary site assessment and the remediation of residual contaminants.

(b) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In developing the voluntary guidelines under subsection (a), the Administrator shall consider, at a minimum—

(1) relevant standards, guidelines, and requirements found in Federal, State, and local laws and regulations;

(2) the varying types and locations of former methamphetamine laboratories; and

(3) the expected cost of carrying out any proposed guidelines.

(c) **STATES.**—The voluntary guidelines should be designed to assist State and local governments in the development and the implementation of legislation and other policies to apply state-of-the-art knowledge and research results to the remediation of former methamphetamine laboratories. The Administrator shall work with State and local governments and other relevant non-Federal agencies and organizations, including through the conference described in section 5, to promote and encourage the appropriate adoption of the voluntary guidelines.

(d) **UPDATING THE GUIDELINES.**—The Administrator shall periodically update the voluntary guidelines as the Administrator, in consultation with States and other interested parties, determines to be necessary and appropriate to incorporate research findings and other new knowledge.

### SEC. 4. RESEARCH PROGRAM.

The Administrator shall establish a program of research to support the development and revision of the voluntary guidelines described in section 3. Such research shall—

(1) identify methamphetamine laboratory-related chemicals of concern;

(2) assess the types and levels of exposure to chemicals of concern identified under paragraph (1), including routine and accidental exposures, that may present a significant risk of adverse biological effects, and the research necessary to better address biological effects and to minimize adverse human exposures;

(3) evaluate the performance of various methamphetamine laboratory cleanup and remediation techniques; and

(4) support other research priorities identified by the Administrator in consultation with States and other interested parties.

### SEC. 5. TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER CONFERENCE.

(a) **CONFERENCE.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and at least every third year thereafter, the Administrator shall convene a conference of appropriate State agencies, as well as individuals or organizations involved in research and other activities directly related to the environmental, or biological impacts of former methamphetamine laboratories. The conference should be a forum for the Administrator to provide information on the guidelines developed under section 3 and on the latest findings from the research program described in section 4, and for the non-Federal participants to provide information on the problems and needs of States and localities and their experience with guidelines developed under section 3.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 3 months after each conference, the Administrator shall submit a report to the Congress that summarizes the proceedings of the conference, including a summary of any recommendations or concerns raised by the non-Federal participants and how the Administrator intends to respond to them. The report shall also be made widely available to the general public.

### SEC. 6. RESIDUAL EFFECTS STUDY.

(a) **STUDY.**—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall enter into an arrangement with the National Academy of Sciences for a study of the status and quality of research on the residual effects of methamphetamine laboratories. The study shall identify research gaps and recommend an agenda for the research program described in section 4. The study shall pay particular attention to the need for research on the impacts of methamphetamine laboratories on—

(1) the residents of buildings where such laboratories are, or were, located, with particular emphasis given to biological impacts on children; and

(2) first responders.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 3 months after the completion of the study, the Administrator shall transmit to Congress a report on how the Administrator will use the results of the study to carry out the activities described in sections 3 and 4.

### SEC. 7. METHAMPHETAMINE DETECTION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

The Director of National Institute of Standards and Technology, in consultation with the Administrator, shall support a research program to develop—

(1) new methamphetamine detection technologies, with emphasis on field test kits and site detection; and

(2) appropriate standard reference materials and validation procedures for methamphetamine detection testing.

### SEC. 8. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to affect or limit the application of, or any obligation to comply with, any State or Federal environmental law or regulation, including the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) and the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.).

### SEC. 9. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Environmental Protection Agency to carry out this Act \$1,750,000 for each of the fiscal years 2007 and 2008.

(b) **NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Institute of Standards and Technology to carry out this Act \$750,000 for each of the fiscal years 2007 and 2008.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 365, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 365, the Methamphetamine Remediation Research Act. This is the same legislation which passed the House a year ago, but was not enacted into law. Unfortunately, the need for this legislation is just as strong today as it was then.

We have a terrible problem with methamphetamine in Tennessee and the Nation as a whole. One side effect of the methamphetamine epidemic is the chemical waste dump left behind by meth cooks. H.R. 365 focuses on cleanup needs for former meth labs, a tremendous problem facing communities across the country.

The Drug Enforcement Agency reported more than 12,500 domestic meth lab seizures in 2005 alone. These meth labs, most often found in residential settings, are contaminated, not only with methamphetamine but also with other toxic residue associated with the production of meth. These chemical residues pollute the inside of a residence and also threaten septic and water systems. The meth epidemic has not only devastated families, it has also left thousands of potentially toxic waste dumps spread across the country.

Right now, there are unsuspecting families living in homes that were once illegal meth labs. Dangerous and hidden toxic substances on these sites threaten the health of these families, with children being the most vulnerable to the devastating long-term effects of exposure.

H.R. 365 addresses the specific problem of determining the level of cleanup required to ensure that a former meth lab is safe for occupation.

I want to stress that H.R. 365 is not a Federal mandate. Rather, it requires the EPA to develop model, voluntary, health-based cleanup guidelines for use by States and localities if they desire.

In addition, H.R. 365 authorizes this to initiate a research program to develop meth detection equipment for field use.

This will help law enforcement agents detect active meth labs faster and assist in measuring the levels of contamination in former meth labs.

Finally, H.R. 365 requires a study by the National Academy of Sciences on

the long-term health impact of exposure to meth labs on children and first responders. It authorizes a total of \$5 million for EPA and NIST to carry out these activities over 2 years, a bargain by any standard. The bill is endorsed by the National Association of Counties, the National Sheriffs' Association, the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Narcotics Officers' Associations' Coalition, the National Association of Realtors, the National Multi-Housing Council and the National Apartment Association.

H.R. 365 is not the complete solution to the methamphetamine epidemic. Unfortunately, there will always be people who decide to harm themselves by using methamphetamines, dangerous drugs such as meth or manufacturing dangerous drugs such as meth.

□ 1030

H.R. 365 aims to protect innocent people whose lives are endangered by these illegal activities.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Ranking Member HALL, Representative WU, and Representative CALVERT for working with me on this legislation in the past Congress, and for sponsoring this legislation for reintroduction in the 110th Congress, as well as I want to thank Mike Quear for the good staff work that has helped bring this bill before us.

This bill is an important component in helping our local communities combat the meth problem. I would urge everyone to vote "yes" on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to place two letters in the RECORD.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND  
TECHNOLOGY,

Washington, DC, February 7, 2007.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,  
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,  
House of Representatives, Rayburn House  
Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DINGELL: Thank you for your willingness to allow floor consideration of H.R. 365, the Methamphetamine Remediation Research Act of 2007, to proceed unimpeded. As you may know, this bill addresses very important environmental research issues and is a priority for our caucus; approximately half of the House Democratic Caucus has cosponsored the legislation.

I have been cognizant of the jurisdictional limits of the Committee on Science and Technology since I began writing this legislation. Therefore, I instructed my staff to work with the Office of the Parliamentarian to assure a sole referral to the Committee on Science in the 109th Congress and to the Committee on Science and Technology in the 110th Congress. I am pleased that they were successful in both Congresses in keeping the bill within the Science and Technology Committee's black letter jurisdiction over environmental research and development and standardization of weights and measures.

I acknowledge that your committee, if it had so chosen, would have had the right to request a sequential referral of this legislation, both in the 109th Congress and in the 110th Congress. Since this did not occur, I am unable to predict whether the Speaker would have given the Committee on Energy and Commerce a formal referral. I would like to make it clear that I recognize that sequential referrals sometimes do occur at this

point in the process and I further recognize that our proceeding to the Floor of the House with this legislation should not be construed as deciding this issue one way or the other.

As you requested, I will insert our two letters in the Congressional Record as part of the consideration of the bill on the House floor. I value your advice and expertise and welcome it any time you wish to share it on legislation that has been referred to the Committee on Science and Technology.

Sincerely,

BART GORDON,  
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,  
Washington, DC, February 6, 2007.

Hon. BART GORDON,  
Chairman, Committee on Science, House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write with regard to H.R. 365, a bill to provide for a research program for remediation of closed methamphetamine production laboratories. You introduced it on January 10, 2007, and it is scheduled for floor consideration tomorrow under the procedure for suspending the rules.

As you know, I support passage of the bill, and I do not intend to object to its consideration on the House floor. I want to make clear, however, that my support is provided with the understanding that you and I agree that the referral and consideration of the bill does not in any way serve as a jurisdictional precedent as to our two committees.

I request that you send to me a letter confirming our agreement and that, as part of the consideration of the bill on the House floor, you insert our two letters in the Congressional Record. If you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact me or have your staff contact Jonathan Cordone, Deputy Chief Counsel to the Committee, at ext. 5-2927.

Sincerely,

JOHN D. DINGELL,  
Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of H.R. 365, the Methamphetamine Remediation Research Act of 2007, that was introduced by our colleague Mr. GORDON, who is obviously the chairman of the Science and Technology Committee, along with ranking member Mr. HALL, Mr. CALVERT, and also Mr. WU.

I want to especially thank Congressman CALVERT for his steadfast leadership on this issue for such a long time. He has really been the voice on this issue in Congress for a long time, and has worked with everybody on both sides of the aisle on this legislation.

As Mr. GORDON said, he stated just a while ago, this legislation is very similar to the legislation that passed the Science Committee and the House in the 109th Congress. Mr. Speaker, it passed by a voice vote then. This one also, though, addressed changes made by the Senate in that bill that passed the Congress before.

Over the past decade this issue, the spread of methamphetamine, has been plaguing really everyplace around the country. It has been killing individ-

uals, destroying families, devastating communities in every conceivable part of our country in areas that you would not think that this could happen, in residential areas. It is a huge, huge problem.

We also have to deal with the harmful residue that this horrible substance leaves behind in homes. Those substances cause harm to human beings and to their health for years to come. This legislation focuses on the cleanup of the former meth labs.

H.R. 365 addresses the significant contamination associated with these labs and would provide voluntary guidelines to clean up the former labs. And, again, as I said a little while ago, these meth labs are present all over the United States in residential areas, in places that one would never think this could happen.

Currently, Mr. Speaker, there are no national guidelines or regulations on how to clean up and remediate a residential meth lab for reoccupation of people. States and localities are struggling to protect the public and also the law enforcement officers and the first responders, and they are trying to find a solution that is practical also for the property owners.

Many of the ingredients used in the manufacture of this product are highly dangerous and toxic, and are believed to damage the skin, the eyes and the lungs of even people who move into a house where there used to be a lab. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to hopefully the passage of this legislation and the Senate sending it to the desk of the President for his signature.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, let me first compliment Mr. DIAZ-BALART for a good explanation of the bill and the threats that go with this.

I now would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CARNAHAN), a member of our Science Committee.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 365, the Methamphetamine Remediation Research Act of 2007. This bill will be an important tool in the methamphetamine epidemic that is sweeping across our country.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman GORDON for moving these bills so quickly through the Science Committee so that we may continue the antimeth initiatives in this new Congress. The bill charges the EPA with the development of health-based guidelines to assist State and local authorities in cleaning up former meth lab sites.

According to the 2006 National Drug Threat Survey of State and Local Law Enforcement, meth was named most often the greatest drug threat. Well, I am proud to say that my home State of Missouri has been a leader nationwide on issues such as expansion of stem cell



research and creation and implementation of the historic preservation tax credit. My State, unfortunately, has the most prevalent meth problem.

Based on data from 2005, Missouri had a reported staggering 2,252 meth lab incidents, the highest in the Nation. Jefferson County, in the heart of my district, has the highest number of meth lab incidents in Missouri, reporting 259 incidents in 2005 alone.

I have seen firsthand the negative and harmful impact of this in my district. I have met with law enforcement throughout my district and compliment them on their aggressive and innovative programs.

But the large amount of meth lab incidents in Missouri means that police, firefighters and other first-line responders are exposed to meth labs in the line of duty. While some States have already passed laws to require cleanup of meth labs, Missouri and many others have not.

This bill is vital, because we need the EPA to create these voluntary guidelines for first responders nationwide. This bill would be beneficial in determining the effects of meth exposure. In addition to creating guidelines for cleanup, the bill would also require the National Academy of Sciences to study the long-term impacts on first responders, children and property owners.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join Chairman GORDON, Mr. HALL and Mr. WU as the lead sponsors of H.R. 365, the Methamphetamine Remediation Act of 2007.

Mr. Speaker, we were very close to sending this legislation to the President for signature at the end of the last Congress, so I greatly appreciate the chairman keeping this issue at the forefront of this Congress and for steering the bill quickly through the Science and Technology Committee at the start of the 110.

Mr. Speaker, I also thank the committee's majority and minority staffs who have diligently worked together and with the Senate over the last few years to develop and revise this legislation.

As a founder and cochairman of the Congressional Caucus to Fight and Control Methamphetamine, I know the meth epidemic in our country shows no deference to district or party line. This is an issue everyone can agree is wreaking havoc on communities across our Nation.

As mentioned by my colleagues, H.R. 365 focused its efforts on procedures and standards needed to decontaminate a site where a methamphetamine lab is found so our communities can more thoroughly remediate these sites.

The creation of voluntary health-based remediation guidelines for former meth labs, created by the Environmental Protection Agency, will protect and ensure the health of our citizens and the surrounding environment.

This is a distressing issue with many, and certainly my area of Riverside, California, and, quite frankly, most of America has been all too familiar. Meth poses significant environmental threats as its production leaves, as mentioned, 5 to 6 pounds of toxic waste per pound of methamphetamine developed.

The Drug Enforcement Agency estimates that more than 68 percent of all meth labs are located in ordinary homes in rural and residential areas. State and local agencies need all of the resources and tools that we can provide them to remediate the contamination that remains after meth labs are dismantled so that innocent families are not in danger.

Although we are all aware that more needs to be done to win the fight against this devastating drug, I am convinced that H.R. 365 will be an important step and will be welcomed by our communities.

So I thank Chairman GORDON for his good work, and I encourage all of my colleagues to pass this commonsense legislation.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. CALVERT for cosponsoring this legislation last session as well as this session, and for his work as cochair of the important Methamphetamine Caucus.

I now yield 2 minutes to my friend from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN), an alumnus of the Science Committee.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it was a preeminent privilege to serve with the gentleman on the Science Committee when he was a chairperson in waiting, and I am honored to call you Mr. Chairman today.

Mr. Speaker, this is a serious problem. I beseech, I urge, I implore, I beg that my colleagues would support this legislation, H.R. 365.

365 is an appropriate number for this legislation, because this is a 365/24/7 problem. And this problem must be dealt with. This is a dangerous drug to produce. It is toxic. It is poisonous. It is deadly. It can explode. Twenty percent of all labs are discovered because of fire or explosion.

And as bad as this is, there is a sinister side to this drug. Innocent people are being harmed by virtue of this drug being in residential property that landlords are not aware of. And when these innocent persons move in with their children, the residue from this product is causing damage to the liver, damage to the lungs, may cause cancer, and it creates problems in the neurological system.

Mr. Speaker, we must act now. These labs are in all 50 States. No State is beyond the scope of this problem. Two-thirds of the residential settings are victimized with these labs. Between 2003 and 2005, the DEA pointed out that 47,000 lab incidents occurred. We must act now if the innocent are to be protected from this deadly assassin. I beg that we all support this important piece of legislation.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL).

(Mr. BOSWELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 365, and I associate myself with the remarks just made. Well said. It is a scourge to our country.

I want to thank Chairman GORDON and Ranking Member HALL of the Science and Technology Committee for their hard work on this important piece of legislation. I also want to thank the Meth Caucus leadership, Messrs. CANNON, CALVERT and LARSEN, who I have worked with.

Meth has wreaked havoc on our communities. Every district in our Nation has in some way felt the impact of what methamphetamine can do to families, the burden it places on local law enforcement and public health, and the toxic effect it has on the environment. In my State of Iowa alone, we had roughly 350 meth lab busts last year. Although this number is significantly down from 1,500 busts in 2004, it still presents a tremendous problem for my State.

I personally thank Marvin Van Haaften of Marion County, our recent drug czar, for his great work and leadership in this cause. In order to effectively continue our efforts to eradicate meth from our communities, we need every piece of information available. This legislation will increase the pool of information that local law enforcement and others rely upon.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased that this legislation takes the necessary steps to coordinate the development of meth detection equipment with emphasis on field detection equipment. I believe having reliable equipment in the field will not only strengthen meth-related cases, it will increase the safety of our law enforcement officers, enabling them to take necessary steps to protect themselves from the toxic environment caused by the production of methamphetamine.

Furthermore, the study commissioned by the legislation exposes the long-term effects of exposure of meth labs on children and first responders. This help is long overdue. I am proud this legislation addresses the issue.

Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of H.R. 365, I strongly urge my colleagues to support and pass this measure.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the former youngest attorney general in the Nation, who saw firsthand the problem with methamphetamine in Kentucky (Mr. CHANDLER).

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today in support of my

good friend and chairman, the fine gentleman from Tennessee, who is on a mission of mercy.

Mr. Speaker, this issue is extremely important to all people in this country, and truly it represents an epidemic. It is a problem that does affect every single State in our country, and unfortunately it has had a disproportionate effect on my home State of Kentucky, as I know it has also in Tennessee.

Law enforcement officials, in my view, have done an incredible job in fighting the meth epidemic. According to the Office of Drug Control Policy, in June of last year, there were almost 57 percent fewer methamphetamine lab seizures in Kentucky than in the previous years; however, our State still ended the year with well over 500 meth lab incidents.

Our law enforcement officials cannot do it alone. Fighting production of meth is not the last battle we face when dealing with this terrible drug. We have to take it a step further.

□ 1045

Meth is highly volatile, and because it is often produced in homes, apartments or hotel rooms, this drug can threaten the health of whomever may occupy that space later. We must ensure that the environments of our families are free of the remnants of meth production. We must take the necessary steps so that the authorities know how to best clean former sites and develop new technologies for detecting this harmful drug. And, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what this bill does.

I encourage my colleagues to support this fine piece of legislation and help our communities in their fight against this truly difficult epidemic.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to a former DA from New York State who, once again, has seen this epidemic firsthand and has dealt with it there, and now, as a new Member of Congress, he is dealing with it on a national basis, Mr. ARCURI.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, as a former DA from upstate New York, I know firsthand the scourge that methamphetamine has laid upon our rural areas. And I represented a district that was both urban and rural, and I saw that methamphetamines did to the rural areas what crack cocaine did to the urban areas. And I think that it is imperative that we take these steps that we are taking to fight methamphetamines.

The difference, however, between methamphetamines and crack is that there is a derivative effect that methamphetamine has, and that is that it affects the people who live in the households of people who produce methamphetamines and law enforcement officers when they go into those areas. So it is very important that this

bill is passed because it does exactly what local law enforcement needs, and that is for the Federal Government to act in a way that develops strategies for fighting methamphetamines, strategies for protecting our law enforcement officials.

So I strongly support this bill, and urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Oregon has long had a terrible problem with methamphetamines, and a real fighter there has been Ms. HOOLEY, and I yield 2 minutes to her.

Ms. HOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Chairman, thank you so much for all of your leadership on this issue. I applaud you.

In my three decades of public service, I don't think I have ever seen a problem as pervasive or as damaging as the methamphetamine epidemic that is sweeping our country. Meth is a serious threat to public health and safety, not only because of the highly addictive nature of the drug and what it does to the user, but also the ease of production and the danger of toxic chemicals used to manufacture it.

These toxic chemicals cause significant property damage from residue contamination in the floors and the walls of the house, to fires, even deadly explosions. Chemicals used to make meth are highly flammable and toxic. It is estimated, for every pound of meth produced, we have 6 to 7 pounds of toxic waste.

And meth addicts don't care where the toxic chemicals end up, often dumping the waste down the drain or onto the ground, leaving it to contaminate the community's water supply and their soil.

In conversations with local health officials in my district, they have stressed to me the harmful health effects that living not only in the former meth houses but even next door to one can have on people, particularly children and the elderly.

Because the meth epidemic began in the west coast before moving east, Oregon has long been a leader in the fight against meth and the destruction it brings to our communities. We have been a leader in developing standards for the cleanup of meth labs, setting standards for decontamination and certifying that a property has been cleaned by a State-licensed contractor before it is sold or rented. Oregon's standards have been seen as the highest in the Nation. I would encourage the EPA to look at Oregon as they develop national standards. But we need a consistent Federal standard that is based on research and best practices.

When the cost to clean up a small, single family home can easily reach \$15,000, we need to make sure that we are spending our money wisely by using the best possible remediation methods. This bill will help us do this.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 365.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman GORDON for introducing this important piece of legislation, the Methamphetamine Remediation Research Act.

In my home State of Indiana and throughout our country, meth labs are a growing problem, and we all know this. In Jackson County, Indiana, where I grew up and raised my family, 64 meth labs were found there in 2003. That was the fourth highest total in the State.

These meth labs pose a serious threat to the safety and physical well-being of communities and particularly our Nation's children. This bill will provide States with specific guidelines and advice on the most effective way to decontaminate a meth lab. In addition, this bill will also help keep our local law enforcement safe during a meth lab cleanup.

I would like to thank our law enforcement agents who I have had many, many conversations with about this growing problem in America and Indiana. I want to thank them for working to dramatically lower the number of meth labs in Indiana to fewer than 1,000 for the first time since 2002. We need to continue to support our local law enforcement and give them the knowledge and tools they need to make sure our communities stay safe.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, no Member of this Congress has done more to fight this epidemic of methamphetamine than the cochairman of the Methamphetamine Caucus, Mr. LARSEN. I thank him for his good work and yield him 1 minute.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in full support of H.R. 365, and I want to thank Chairman GORDON, Mr. HALL and my fellow co-chairs of the Meth Caucus, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BOSWELL and Mr. CANNON for their work in drafting this bill, getting it to the floor here today.

Meth is literally a chemical cocktail. It is made from hazardous caustic substances. In the process of cooking a batch of meth, those chemicals seep into the interior of a home, and often innocent families move into these houses and apartments completely unaware that their new home was once used to cook meth. It isn't until they become ill that they know something is terribly wrong.

The DEA reported over 12,000 meth lab busts in 2005 in 49 States. There are currently no Federal standards or health-based guidelines to determine when a former lab is safe to inhabit.

This bill will create the research both to know when a home is safe to reinhabit and the health impacts of exposure to a lab. We owe it the children



found in meth labs each year to know how their health has been affected and how best to treat them. This bill does that.

As a cochair of the Meth Caucus, I am very pleased to see an important meth bill like this one brought to the floor, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, our final speaker is the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) and I yield him 1½ minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, as an active member of the Congressional Caucus to Fight and Control Methamphetamines, and a sponsor of this bill, I am pleased that early in this Congress we are addressing a killer that strikes fear in the hearts of parents and exacts great cost from our communities.

Over 10 million Americans age 12 and older are reported to have tried methamphetamine. In 2005, in Texas alone, some 250-plus meth labs were seized. Their dangers are not limited to the criminal manufacturers of this wretched drug or the consumers of this poison. Rather, these highly toxic labs represent a much wider threat. Even the remains of the illicit production of a meth lab can, by themselves, produce life-threatening injuries, death, and destruction of property.

Our votes today supporting the Methamphetamine Remediation Research Act are votes to protect our families, our neighborhoods, and support our law enforcement organizations as they attack the destructive impact of meth labs. We must continue to work with local, State and Federal law enforcement to ensure that we are combating this scourge at every level—that our local officials have the technology, the funding, and the support they need to detect these labs, close them down and clean them up.

I applaud the leadership of Chairman GORDON and all those who have worked on this piece of legislation. We took some action last year and there is much more action which is necessary, but this is a very important next step in our efforts against meth.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I just want to also thank the chairman of the Science and Technology Committee, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON), for putting this on the top of his agenda, at the top of his priorities. It is an important issue, and I want to thank him for doing that.

Mr. Speaker, we have no further requests for time, and so I would yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it certainly is nice to see a good bipartisan piece of legislation pass through this House. It is a good way to start. I appreciate the cooperation of everybody involved.

In closing, I want to say that this targeted bill can help every community where a meth lab has been discovered. I would urge a "yes" vote on H.R. 365.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 365, the Methamphetamine Remediation Research Act of 2007. This critically important piece of legislation helps detect and safely dispose of Methamphetamine production sites across this nation.

The issue of illegal methamphetamines is a top health concern for me and my constituents in the 12th district of California. According to the National Drug Intelligence Center's February 2005 National Drug Threats Assessment Report, the level of methamphetamine consumption in San Francisco is critically high compared with that of most other cities in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, let me start by emphasizing the extreme danger that methamphetamines pose on today's youth. Methamphetamine is a drug concocted from a variety of household items including gasoline, paint thinner, battery acid, propane, and lighter fluid among other things, cooked together to form a powder or crystal like substance that is either smoked, ingested or injected.

According to the Office of National Drug Control Policy methamphetamines are a highly addictive drug that can cause progressive social and occupational deterioration and lead to episodes of violent behavior, paranoia, anxiety, confusion, and insomnia. Habitual usage can lead to physical complications such as inflammation of the heart lining, damaged blood vessels, skin abscesses, as well as variety of cardiovascular problems that ultimately can lead to death. Doctors have equated damage to the brain caused by methamphetamine use with brain damage caused by Alzheimer's disease, stroke, and epilepsy. Psychotic symptoms can sometimes persist for months or years after drug use has ceased.

According to the 2005 National Survey on Drug Use and Health an estimated 10.4 million Americans aged 12 or older used methamphetamine at least once in their lifetimes. The Drug Abuse Warning Network estimates that in 2004 methamphetamine was involved in 73,400 emergency room visits.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the horrific effects that methamphetamine has on the human body the caustic nature of the production of the drug has enormously detrimental effects on the environment. This horrendous drug is produced in what is often referred to as "Meth Labs." These laboratories can exist virtually anywhere, in fact methamphetamine laboratories have been found in all 50 states. They are overwhelmingly hidden amongst residential communities and pose a detrimental risk to millions of Americans. It is estimated that methamphetamine production creates approximately six pounds of waste for every one pound of product. If not properly cleaned, this highly volatile waste product leaves a toxic residue that can threaten the health of whoever may come in contact with it.

According to the Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA) there were more than 47,000 reported Meth Lab incidents between the years 2003 and 2005. Nearly one in five of those were fires or explosions caused by the highly toxic and potentially flammable ingredients used to create the drug.

Even after these Meth Labs are discovered by authorities and shut down, and the crimi-

nals operating the labs are long incarcerated, the effects of their morally reprehensible action can continue to adversely affect the health and well-being of the innocent citizens living and working nearby.

While some states including my home State of California have taken the initiative to pass laws that outline methamphetamine laboratory cleanup procedures, there are currently no federal standards for cleaning up these potentially toxic sites. Mr. Speaker, the time is long overdue for us to take action to seek out and shut down these labs in a safe and healthy way. H.R. 365, The Methamphetamine Remediation Research Act of 2007 will do just that by creating a road map to assure the safety of our children and first responders.

The bill authorizes \$1.75 million in funding for the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to research best practices programs for detection and proper sanitation of methamphetamine labs. It will also specifically authorize \$750,000 for the National Institute of Standards and Technology in collaboration with the EPA to research and develop methamphetamine detection equipment. Thirdly, the bill will direct the EPA to work with the National Academy of Sciences to study the long term health effects of methamphetamine laboratory exposure to children and first responders.

Mr. Speaker, the war against meth is being waged on many fronts. This bill is a critical step to ensuring that law enforcement agencies and first responders are provided with the best information and ability to mitigate the numerous detrimental effects caused by methamphetamine production. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation in an effort to rid our communities of this epidemic.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 365, the Methamphetamine Research Remediation Act. Methamphetamines represent a tremendous growing threat to the fabric of our society. Last year, I held more than 40 town hall meetings across Southern New Mexico, listening to law enforcement, health officials, recovering addicts, and other experts. Time and time again I heard horror stories about whole families in my district destroyed by methamphetamines. It is our duty as members of the United States Congress to protect America from all enemies foreign and domestic. Mr. Speaker, methamphetamines are one the greatest domestic threats that our nation faces. We must confront its production, its trafficking, its abuse, and its effect on the land itself.

Meth is a problem concentrated in the West and Southwest, but be aware that this great evil is moving across America, and soon no one will be able to say it is not their problem. As meth spreads across our nation it leaves a trail of destroyed lives, families, homes, communities, property and public lands in its wake. H.R. 365 the Methamphetamine Research Remediation Act of 2007 will set needed standards for the clean-up of property and public lands destroyed by methamphetamines. Unlike other drugs, the cooking of methamphetamines is hazardous to everything that it touches and can render houses and property uninhabitable. H.R. 365 will address the environmental impact of methamphetamines, and how to recover our properties and lands.

In the Second District of New Mexico half-million dollar homes have been left uninhabitable, and state parks have become unusable. This destruction occurs because of methamphetamine cooking and the dumping of meth related chemicals. I fear that unsuspecting New Mexicans will encounter these environmental hazards and endanger their lives. H.R. 365 The Methamphetamines Research Remediation Act of 2007, will provide communities across America with the proper information and procedures on how to clean up meth labs and reclaim the land they have poisoned.

This bill is the first in many steps we should take to track and fight Meth in our communities. I have introduced H.R. 304, the CLEAN TOWN Act to help in our battle against meth. As we talk about this bill, I hope my colleagues will examine my legislation that has tremendous promise to help change the way we fight drugs and drug dealers. I urge all my colleagues to join me in fighting Meth and help us save America's families.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, as Congress debates measures to clean up meth labs, I believe it is important to offer a physician's perspective to help some people understand why this drug is so dangerous. Also called crank, blue acid, speed, and ice, meth is a popular drug because it is cheap, easy to manufacture, and acts as a powerful stimulant. An investment of just a few hundred dollars in over-the-counter medications and chemicals can produce thousands of dollars worth of methamphetamine, which can be cooked in something as small as a suitcase.

The average meth "cook" annually teaches an average of ten people how to make the drug. Typical ingredients include over-the-counter cold and asthma medications containing ephedrine or pseudoephedrine, in addition to red phosphorous, hydrochloric acid, drain cleaner, battery acid, lye, lantern fuel, and antifreeze.

In fact, users of this drug are often not aware that they are potentially ingesting toxic chemicals. The toxic fumes emitted during manufacturing are highly flammable, even explosive, and can suffocate plants, animals, and even people. For my colleagues concerned about the environment, each pound of meth produced leaves behind five or six pounds of toxic waste. Meth "cooks" often pour leftover chemicals and byproduct sludge down drains in nearby plumbing, storm drains, or directly onto the ground, creating long-term hazards: the chemical waste can remain in our soil and groundwater for years. The average cost to clean up a methamphetamine laboratory ranges between \$2,000 and \$3,000. However, this does not include the ancillary costs of cleaning up a former laboratory.

In February 2005, the Atlanta Police, U.S. Drug Enforcement, the MCS drug taskforce, and other law enforcement agencies discovered Georgia's first "super lab" at a house in Smyrna, Georgia, which is in the Congressional District I represent. With 39 pounds of meth-crystal and 250 gallons of the drug in liquid form, one mistake could have destroyed an entire neighborhood due to the explosive volatility of the materials.

No longer just the addictive scourge of 1970's biker gangs, meth is a very real problem that affects our children and neighbors in very real ways. The drug works directly on the brain and spinal cord by interacting with

neurotransmitters—chemical substances produced in nerve cells—which communicate throughout the body. The foremost neurotransmitter affected by methamphetamine is dopamine, which is involved with our natural reward system. This is known as the automatic nervous system. For example, a pat on the back for a job well done, getting enjoyment from family and social interactions, and the feeling that our lives are meaningful, all rely on dopamine transmission.

With properties that target the nervous system, it should be no surprise that side effects of meth include extreme paranoia, violent behavior, rapid weight loss, tooth loss, hallucinations, unexplained voices, pale complexion, speech impediments, Parkinson's disease-like symptoms, depression, insomnia, suicide contemplation, and schizophrenia. It is important to mention these various symptoms and health problems because without proper clean-up unseen chemicals can spread from one home through entire neighborhoods, creating an unknown danger to current and future owners.

Considering the numerous dangers caused by methamphetamines, I believe it is more important than ever to make sure our law enforcement community has the laws, equipment, and training necessary to protect our communities from this drug. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the House of Representatives for the passage of today's Methamphetamine Remediation Research Act of 2007, which includes substantive legislation that will establish voluntary guidelines to assist state and local governments in the development and implementation of policies for the clean-up of former methamphetamine laboratories.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 365, the Methamphetamine Remediation Research Act to initiate standards for methamphetamine (meth) cleanup in our neighborhoods. As a cosponsor of H.R. 365, I believe this legislation is necessary in order to protect unsuspecting families from the dangers of illegal meth labs and provide the necessary tools for law enforcement to detect labs throughout our communities.

As a member of the Congressional Caucus to Fight and Control Methamphetamine and a former law enforcement official, I am actively working with my colleagues to decrease methamphetamine use. In my home state of Illinois, there were 1,189 methamphetamine laboratory seizures reported in 2005, many in my district in Southern Illinois. In order to combat meth, I believe we need a comprehensive plan to deal with the environmental, health, and law enforcement challenges facing our communities because of the growing use of this dangerous drug.

Mr. Speaker, the national guidelines this bill creates will help protect our communities by ensuring that dangerous meth labs are cleaned properly and efficiently. It is my continued hope that by raising national awareness about meth and providing increased federal resources to combat the drug problem, we can make significant progress to overcome methamphetamine use. This legislation is a critical step we can take toward this goal and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 365.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 365.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### RECOGNIZING THE WORK AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF MR. BRITT "MAX" MAYFIELD, DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL HURRICANE CENTER'S TROPICAL PREDICTION CENTER UPON HIS RETIREMENT

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 72) recognizing the work and accomplishments of Mr. Britt "Max" Mayfield, Director of the National Hurricane Center's Tropical Prediction Center upon his retirement.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### H. RES. 72

Whereas Mr. Britt "Max" Mayfield is known as the "Walter Cronkite of Weather", trustworthy, calming, and always giving the facts straight;

Whereas Mr. Mayfield is a Fellow of the American Meteorological Society and a nationally and internationally recognized expert on hurricanes, and has presented papers at national and international scientific meetings, lectured in training sessions sponsored by the United Nations World Meteorological Organization, and provided numerous interviews to electronic and print media worldwide;

Whereas in 2006, Mr. Mayfield received the Government Communicator of the Year Award from the National Association of Government Communicators, a national not-for-profit professional network of government employees who disseminate information within and outside the government, as well as the prestigious Neil Frank Award from the National Hurricane Conference;

Whereas in 2005, Mr. Mayfield received a Presidential Rank Award for Meritorious Service from President George W. Bush and was named ABC Television Network's "Person of the Week" after Hurricane Katrina;

Whereas in 2004, the Federal Coordinator for Meteorological Services and Supporting Research presented the Richard Hagemeyer Award to Mr. Mayfield at the Interdepartmental Hurricane Conference for his contributions to the hurricane warning program of the United States;

Whereas also in 2004, the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences Suncoast Chapter recognized Mr. Mayfield with the Governor's Award, more commonly known as an "Emmy", for extraordinary contributions to television by an individual not otherwise eligible for an Emmy;

Whereas in 2000, Mr. Mayfield received an Outstanding Achievement Award at the National Hurricane Conference and in 1996 the American Meteorological Society honored him with the Francis W. Reichelderfer Award for exemplary performance as coordinator of the National Hurricane Center's

hurricane preparedness training for emergency preparedness officials and the general public;

Whereas Mr. Mayfield and his colleagues have been recognized by the Department of Commerce with Gold Medals for work during Hurricane Andrew in 1992 and Hurricane Isabel in 2003, and a Silver Medal during Hurricane Gilbert in 1988;

Whereas Mr. Mayfield was also awarded a National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Bronze Medal for creating a public-private partnership to support the disaster preparedness of the United States; and

Whereas Mr. Mayfield is the current Chairman of the World Meteorological Organization Regional Association-IV, which supports 26 members from Atlantic and eastern Pacific countries: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) honors Mr. Britt "Max" Mayfield's commitment to improving the accuracy of hurricane forecasting as Director of the National Hurricane Center's Tropical Prediction Center;

(2) thanks Mr. Mayfield for his service, which has undoubtedly helped to save countless lives and the property of citizens around the world;

(3) commends Mr. Mayfield's dedication to expanding educational opportunities for State and local emergency management officials;

(4) acknowledges the critical role that Mr. Mayfield has played in forecast and service improvements over his 34-year career;

(5) recognizes the unwavering support of Mr. Mayfield's family in supporting his career;

(6) wishes Mr. Mayfield continued success in his future endeavors; and

(7) recognizes the support and work of the staff of the National Hurricane Center's Tropical Prediction Center during Mr. Mayfield's tenure as Director of the Center.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H. Res. 72, the resolution now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAHONEY) be allowed to control the time on our side. Mr. MAHONEY has taken the lead on this bill, and I appreciate him doing so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution honoring Max Mayfield, former director of NOAA's National Hurricane Center.

In less than 2 years, my home State of Florida suffered damage from four

tropical storms and eight hurricanes. Likewise, on August 29, 2005, Hurricane Katrina made landfall near New Orleans, devastating the gulf coast region of the United States. In the days that followed, we learned that Katrina had left nearly 80 percent of the Crescent City under water, caused an immeasurable amount of damage, displaced thousands of families and resulted in the deaths of nearly 1,500 people.

While hurricanes cannot be prevented, accurate storm forecasting has helped millions of people prepare for them and prepare for evacuation. The individual responsible for providing the public with these accurate and easy-to-understand forecasts was Mr. Mayfield, who retired from the National Hurricane Center on January 3 of this year.

Born in Oklahoma, Mr. Mayfield began his forecasting career with the Air Force in 1970 after graduating from the University of Oklahoma with a degree in mathematics. In 1972, he received his master's degree in meteorology from Florida State University.

Mr. Mayfield joined the National Weather Service as a satellite meteorologist in Miami. During his 34-year career at the center, Mr. Mayfield served as a senior forecaster, deputy director and then director.

Mr. Mayfield has received numerous awards for his work in the field of meteorology. In 1996, the American Meteorological Society presented him with the Francis W. Reichelderfer Award for exemplary performance as coordinator of the National Hurricane Center's hurricane preparedness training for emergency preparedness officials and the general public.

He has also received an Outstanding Achievement Award at the 2000 National Hurricane Conference for developing and expanding educational opportunities for the State and local emergency management officials.

In addition, the U.S. Department of Commerce has recognized Mr. Mayfield with gold medals for his work during hurricanes Andrew, Isabel, and a silver medal during Hurricane Gilbert.

□ 1100

Maybe more important than the many awards, however, are the countless lives that have been saved by the work of Mr. Mayfield and his team at the National Hurricane Center. The Nation is truly grateful to Mr. Mayfield; his wife, Linda; for a lifetime of love and dedication to the National Hurricane Center, and the people in this great country are thankful for his service.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise also in support of House Resolution 72, recognizing the incredible work and the accomplishments of Mr. Max Mayfield, the director of the National Hurricane Center, the Tropical Protection Center, again, of the National Hurricane Center, which is located in Miami, Florida. He has recently retired. I want to also

commend my colleague from Florida (Mr. MAHONEY) for introducing this timely and very good resolution.

As a Floridian, I am keenly aware, Mr. Speaker, of the wrath that Mother Nature can throw our way when she is so inclined to do so, especially when it comes to hurricanes. We all recall that, for example, in a time of just 2 years, 2 short years, Florida had eight hurricanes that actually hit and made landfall on the State of Florida.

Mr. Mayfield has worked and strived to improve the warning lead times, to increase the understanding of the track of where the hurricanes are going, and also particularly the intensity of those hurricanes.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that always struck me was that, as these storms were coming our way, coming towards the United States, Director Mayfield would actually personally get on the phone. This was not something that was required by his job. He would pick up the phone and call Governors and call mayors and tell them, Hey, this is a real storm. It is coming your way. Get ready. I don't see that you are ready enough. Get ready. And he would make sure that those governments were prepared and evacuating the people that they needed to evacuate to make sure that the people were safe.

He and his staff have helped protect the lives and the property of millions of people in our country and even of other countries, countries throughout the Caribbean.

He is the epitome of a dedicated public servant, Mr. Speaker. He has received many awards, including in 2005 he received the Presidential Rank Award for Meritorious Service from President George W. Bush.

After more than 30 years of distinguished service to weather forecasting and hurricane forecasting, Mr. Max Mayfield retired in January of 2007. I know that the residents of south Florida and of the entire country and all the Caribbean will miss his calm, clear voice when those hurricanes are threatening our shores. His retirement marks the end of an exceptional career, and his successors at the National Hurricane Center will clearly have very large shoes to fill as Max and his wife Linda now prepare to spend a little bit of time, hopefully a lot of time, with their families, because, again, Max has been on call 24/7, and we are used to seeing him on TV, and one always wondered does that man ever sleep? The answer is, Mr. Speaker, that when there was a storm coming, no, he and his staff did not sleep. Well, now he is going to be spend a little more time with his wife Linda and his family.

I know that my colleagues will join this Congress in wishing both him and his wife and his family all the best. We know they will enjoy their time together.

But on a personal note I just want to say, Max, thank you for a life well

lived. Thank you for a job well done. Millions of people are grateful for your sacrifice, for your hard work. We are indebted to you. Thank you, my friend. Enjoy your retirement. But we will miss you.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MAHONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I will now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have got some very important visitors in my office at this time, but I mentioned to them, and I know they understand, that I wanted to come down to speak a minute on someone who has long been south Florida's treasure and really became the national treasure, Max Mayfield, who has saved countless lives.

And with his demeanor and professionalism even in those extraordinarily tense moments, Mr. Speaker, when storms are approaching or have arrived, Max was that great sea of tranquility that helped our communities wherever those storms were approaching through those tense moments. And he is really an extraordinary human being with a wonderful team. So my heart goes out to that team that he helped build and is still there doing great work.

And to Max, as he begins this new chapter in his life, Godspeed, with our profound gratitude for having helped so many for so many years with your very important work, Max Mayfield.

Mr. MAHONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would now like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mr. Britt "Max" Mayfield on an exemplary career of service to his fellow citizens, and to wish him well in his much-deserved retirement.

In his 34 years of service to the Nation, Max Mayfield has personified the dedication and excellence that make the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's National Weather Service one of the crown jewels of the Federal Government.

Since he began forecasting weather for the Air Force in 1970 and over more than three decades with the National Weather Service, Max has helped push forward the science of forecasting to help make our Nation a safer place. But just making better forecasts has never been enough for Max, because a forecast does no good if no one hears it. Mr. Mayfield has also dedicated his career to making sure that his always-improving forecasts got out quickly, as quickly as possible, to the people who need them. He understands not only

the science of forecasting hurricanes, but the science of communication.

There is no doubt in my mind that Max Mayfield's exemplary efforts and those of his hardworking staff at the National Hurricane Center's Tropical Prediction Center have helped communities prepare for impending disasters and have saved lives in communities around the country and around the world.

I am not alone in my esteem for Mr. Mayfield. The American Meteorology Society, the National Association of Government Communicators, ABC Television, the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences, the National Hurricane Conference, the Department of Commerce, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and President George W. Bush have all presented Max with formal awards for his outstanding achievements and service to his craft and to society. And those are just the formal awards. They do not include the many personal "thank yous" that he has received from the very people he has spent his life serving, and from the people whose lives he has helped save.

My colleagues, in Congress we think we are busy, and, indeed, we are. But I understand that in the thick of storm season, Mr. Mayfield sometimes did more than 100 interviews in 1 day. Now, that is busy. I am certain he is looking forward to retirement.

I am pleased to express my deepest gratitude to Max Mayfield and to his endlessly supportive family for sharing him with us for this time.

Max, God bless you and the work you have done. I wish you calm weather and smooth sailing in your retirement.

Mr. MAHONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

We do a lot of important work in Congress, and we pass a lot of good resolutions for good people, but rarely can you actually say that here is a person who has saved thousands upon thousands upon thousands of lives in his work. He is truly a fine, wonderful public servant, and it is wonderful to be able to have the opportunity to now support and vote on this fine resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MAHONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman GORDON and his staff and my colleagues who have helped me put together this resolution and to honor Mr. Mayfield.

I would just like to conclude by saying that we wish Mr. Mayfield a wonderful retirement with his wife Linda and their three kids. And, again, I would like to congratulate him for his exemplary service and his distinguished career at the National Weather Service and National Hurricane Center. The Nation is going to miss him.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAHONEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 72.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### COMMENDING THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA-LINCOLN VOLLEYBALL TEAM FOR WINNING NCAA DIVISION I WOMEN'S VOLLEYBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 99) commending the University of Nebraska-Lincoln volleyball team for winning the NCAA Division I Women's Volleyball Championship, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### H. RES. 99

Whereas the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Husker volleyball team won the 2006 NCAA Division I Women's Volleyball National Championship at the Qwest Center in Omaha, Nebraska, on December 16, 2006;

Whereas Husker junior Sarah Pavan was chosen as the Nation's top collegiate female volleyball player, winning the 2006-07 Honda Sports Award for volleyball;

Whereas Pavan was named the ESPN the Magazine Academic All-American of the Year, becoming Nebraska's 234th Academic All-American and the program's 29th Academic All-American in volleyball, totals that lead the Nation;

Whereas the Huskers completed the 2006 season with a record of 33-1;

Whereas Husker head coach John Cook has led the team to 2 national championships;

Whereas the Husker volleyball team made its sixth appearance in the NCAA finals;

Whereas the 2006 Huskers are only the third team in the history of the NCAA to lead the American Volleyball Coaches Association poll for an entire season;

Whereas the entire Husker volleyball team should be commended for its determination, work ethic, attitude, and heart;

Whereas the University of Nebraska is building an impressive legacy of excellence in its volleyball program; and

Whereas the University of Nebraska volleyball players have brought great honor to themselves, their families, their university, and the State of Nebraska: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) commends the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Husker volleyball team for winning the 2006 NCAA Division I Women's Volleyball National Championship; and

(2) recognizes the achievements of the players, coaches, students, and staff whose hard work and dedication made the Championship possible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members may have 5 legislative days to insert material relevant to House Resolution 99 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the University of Nebraska-Lincoln for winning the NCAA Division I Women's Volleyball Championship.

On December 16, 2006, the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Huskers volleyball team won the 2006 NCAA Division I Championship by defeating the Stanford University Cardinals at the Qwest Center in Omaha, Nebraska.

I want to extend my congratulations to head coach John Cook, head assistant coach Lee Meas, assistant coach Charlene Johnson-Tagaloa, and the director of volleyball operations Lindsay Wischmeier. Also supporting the team was athletic director Steve Pederson and the University of Nebraska-Lincoln chancellor Harvey Perlman.

The Huskers, Mr. Speaker, had an exceptional record of 33-1 and had four All-Americans on their team. Junior Sarah Pavan also won the 2006-2007 Honda Sports Award. This award is given to the Nation's top collegiate female volleyball player. Pavan was also named the ESPN Magazine Academic All-American of the Year.

And I also want to extend my congratulations to the Stanford University Cardinals. The Cardinals had a record of 30-4. The Cardinals were the PAC-10 Conference champions and were honored by four women receiving All-American honors.

□ 1115

Student athletes, as we know, balance a rigorous school workload with the many practices and games in which they compete.

So I am proud of all the student athletes for their dedication to their school work and their sport. The NCAA promotes its 380,000 student athletes to work with numerous service organizations, including the American Red Cross, Habitat for Humanity and the American Cancer Society.

Winning the national championship and finishing the season with a 33-1 record has brought positive national recognition and attention to the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, and I know that the fans of the university will cherish this moment as they look forward to the 2007 season.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I congratulate the University of Nebraska-Lincoln for their success.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise in support of House Resolution 99. This resolution honors the top-ranked University of Nebraska women's volleyball team for their victory over the second-ranked Stanford University Cardinals. The Huskers rallied to defeat Stanford 3-1 for their third NCAA Division I women's volleyball championship in front of a record crowd of 17,209 fans at the Qwest Center in Omaha.

Led by four All-Americans, including national player of the year Sarah Pavan, the Huskers won the school's ninth Big 12 title in 11 years with a 19-1 Big 12 record, and a 33-1 overall record. This is the second national title that the team has won with head coach John Cook leading the team.

I extend my congratulations to Coach John Cook, all of the hard-working players, the fans and the University of Nebraska. I am happy to join my good friends and colleagues, Representatives SMITH, FORTENBERRY, and TERRY, in honoring this exceptional team and all of its accomplishments, and wish all involved success in the future.

My only regret, since I enjoy playing volleyball myself, is that I never had the opportunity to watch them play in person. But it would have been a real pleasure, had I been able to.

I ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Mr. SMITH, the sponsor of this resolution, I apologize on his behalf that he is unable to be here, but he dearly wanted to be here to speak on this resolution. In his absence, I am next pleased to yield 3 minutes to another gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his time and his commendations of the University of Nebraska volleyball team.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to also thank Representative ADRIAN SMITH for originally sponsoring this resolution congratulating all the members of the volleyball team. I am pleased to co-sponsor this resolution as well to bring attention to the national successes of this team out of Lincoln.

Just a month ago, as it was mentioned, the team won the 2006 NCAA Division I women's volleyball championship. I am very proud of the Husker team and particularly proud to say that this team represents all of Nebraska.

Mr. Speaker, success isn't something that just happens. It takes forethought, hard work, persistence and dedication, and the members of the Huskers women's volleyball team certainly earned it.

Every member of the team should be commended for her dedication, as well

as Head Coach John Cook, who led the team with skill and discipline. Under Coach Cook's leadership, the team finished the season with an astounding record of 33-1. Not only did Coach Cook lead this team to a national championship, but this is his third time in that leadership seat.

The University of Nebraska women's volleyball team is a shining example of the best that Nebraska has to offer. Again, I would like to congratulate the team.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank the previous speaker for commending me for my support of Nebraska athletes. That is certainly true, except for one time when I was invited to speak to a conference at the University of Nebraska. At this conference, I was speaking on teaching better mathematics in elementary schools. Then I saw a huge billboard as I was driving into Lincoln to give the speech, and I saw how badly they needed my speech on mathematics, because there was a big billboard that announced "Welcome to the University of Nebraska. Home of the number one football team in America." Well, that year, of course, Michigan was the number one team, but Nebraska refused to concede that.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to another gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, yes, we enjoy, ranking member, former chairman, Michigan Stater, having that 1997 national championship trophy prominently displayed when you walk into the athletic facilities. It is too bad that we weren't able to leave that game on the field back then, but I am sure that Nebraska would have won by 30 or 40 points.

Now, I have to defend the football team, Mr. Speaker, when challenged like that.

But I am so proud of our women's volleyball team and to be a cosponsor with ADRIAN SMITH of this resolution. What an incredible achievement. Our volleyball team started the season ranked number one with high expectations and ended the season number one in a hard-fought duel with Stanford, the number two rated team in the Nation. And some even had the audacity to think that Stanford was a better team. But, boy, it was the match of a century, two titans battling it out. And the University of Nebraska in the fifth game prevailed for the national championship.

Not only are we proud of the University of Nebraska women's volleyball team for their play on the court but also those in attendance. My hometown of Omaha hosted the national championship tournament, and we now hold the record for attendance for a women's volleyball match in America; 17,200 fans attended each session. I think that speaks well of the sports enthusiasm in Nebraska.

I also want to acknowledge one of the players on that team, Sarah Pavan, a junior, who has become the second player in NCAA history to be named the American Volleyball Coaches Association Player of the Year and Academic All-American of the year from ESPN Magazine. That is truly a student athlete.

I urge all of my colleagues to join the Nebraska delegation today in recognizing the outstanding play of our volleyball team, the coaching and the support that this volleyball team has from its fans in Nebraska.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, so I am pleased to yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am just going to close on this resolution and thank my colleagues for bringing it to the floor. This is House Resolution 99, which commends the University of Nebraska-Lincoln volleyball team for winning the NCAA Division I women's volleyball championship. It has been fun for me to listen to my colleagues as they commend this spectacular team. And even though I am a Californian, I still want to let them know that this is a wonderful accomplishment, and particularly, I applaud the women athletes that were part of this contest.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 99, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## RECOGNIZING THE AFRICAN AMERICAN SPIRITUAL AS A NATIONAL TREASURE

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 120) recognizing the African American spiritual as a national treasure.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 120

Whereas beginning in 1619, when slavery was introduced into the European colonies, enslaved Africans remained in bondage until 1865, when the United States ratified the 13th amendment to the Constitution;

Whereas during that period of the history of the United States, the first expression of that unique American music was created by enslaved African Americans who—

(1) used their knowledge of the English language and the Christian religious faith, as it had been taught to them in the New World; and

(2) stealthily wove within the music their experience of coping with human servitude and their strong desire to be free;

Whereas, as a method of survival, enslaved African Americans who were forbidden to speak their native languages, play musical

instruments they had used in Africa, or practice their traditional religious beliefs, relied on their strong African oral tradition of songs, stories, proverbs, and historical accounts to create this original music, now known as spirituals;

Whereas Calvin Earl, a noted performer and educator on African American spirituals, remarked that the Christian lyrics became a metaphor for freedom from slavery, a secret way for slaves to "communicate with each other, teach their children, record their history, and heal their pain";

Whereas the New Jersey Historical Commission found that "some of those daring and artful runaway slaves who entered New Jersey by way of the Underground Railroad no doubt sang the words of old Negro spirituals like 'Steal Away' before embarking on their perilous journey north";

Whereas African American spirituals spread all over the United States, and the songs we know of today may only represent a small portion of the total number of spirituals that once existed;

Whereas Frederick Douglass, a fugitive slave who would become one of the leading abolitionists of the United States, remarked that the spirituals "told a tale of woe which was then altogether beyond my feeble comprehension; they were tones loud, long, and deep; they breathed the prayer and complaint of souls boiling over with the bitterest anguish. Every tone was a testimony against slavery and a prayer to God for deliverance from chains. . . ."; and

Whereas the American Folklife Preservation Act (Public Law 94-201; 20 U.S.C. 2101 note) finds that "the diversity inherent in American folklife has contributed greatly to the cultural richness of the nation and has fostered a sense of individuality and identity among the American people": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes that African American spirituals are a poignant and powerful genre of music that have become one of the most significant segments of American music in existence;

(2) expresses the deepest gratitude, recognition, and honor to the former enslaved Africans in the United States for their gifts to our Nation, including their original music and oral history; and

(3) requests that the President issue a proclamation that reflects on the important contribution of African American spirituals to American history, and naming the African American spiritual a national treasure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may insert material relevant to H. Res. 120 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the African

American spiritual as a national treasure. From 1619 to 1865, enslaved African Americans created their own unique form of expression known today as spirituals. As African Americans were not allowed to speak their native languages or play African musical instruments, spirituals were incorporated into the English language and the Christian religious faith. These spirituals were the strong African oral tradition of songs, stories, proverbs and historical accounts. Spirituals have been a part of American culture from times of slavery to today, and their legacy is clear in today's gospel music.

Spirituals were also sung during the civil rights movement in the 1960s. Songs that we are familiar with, such as "We Shall Overcome" and "Marching 'Round Selma," were heard in the South to unite African Americans in the struggle for civil rights.

Some of the more commonly known songs, including "Swing Low Sweet Chariot" and "The Gospel Train," used language which described religious activities but had a second meaning relating to the Underground Railroad.

Calvin Earl, a noted performer and educator of African American spirituals, stated that the lyrics used in spirituals became a metaphor for freedom from slavery, and they were a secret way for slaves to communicate with each other, teach their young, record their history and heal their pain.

Frederick Douglass, a fugitive slave who became one of the United States' leading abolitionists, stated that spirituals "told a tale of woe which was then altogether beyond my feeble comprehension" and that "every tone was a testimony against slavery and a prayer to God for deliverance from chains."

This resolution is endorsed by the NAACP and the National Council of Negro Women, and I want to add my voice to theirs in support of helping to preserve a treasured, a really treasured piece of American history.

I urge my colleagues to resoundingly pass this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 120, recognizing African American spirituals as a national treasure.

Simply defined, spirituals are the songs created and first sung by African Americans during the times of slavery. These songs should be celebrated as a part of the American culture today, for they are the source from which gospel, jazz and blues evolved. The lyrics of these songs are tightly linked with the lives of their authors and were inspired by the message of Jesus Christ and the Gospel of the Bible.

□ 1130

The most pervasive message conveyed by spirituals is that of an



enslaved people yearning to be set free. The slaves believed they understood better than anyone what freedom truly meant in both a spiritual and a physical sense, and I believe they were correct in believing that.

The Old Testament Scriptures that are referenced in their songs spoke of deliverance in this world, and they believed God would deliver them from bondage just as he had delivered the people of Israel.

These spirituals are different from hymns and psalms, because their creators used them as a way of sharing the hard condition of being a slave while also singing about their love and faith in God. They used the songs to teach their young, to record their history, and to heal their pain. These songs awakened possibilities in their lives and inspired so many to dream.

Because the slaves were forbidden to learn how to read and write, they had to find ways to communicate secretly. The spirituals were a medium for several layers of communication and meaning.

Throughout the 20th century the spirituals experienced a renaissance as African Americans documented their struggles for equality. During the 1950s and 1960s, before and during rallies for civil rights, demonstrators often sang spirituals such as, "We Shall Overcome," and, believe it or not, "This Little Light of Mine," one of my favorite songs in my childhood.

The lyrics of these new spirituals dealt with improvement and with a new kind of freedom. Many of them were inspired by social problems such as segregation, drug and alcohol abuse, and a basic lack of human equality. Today the congregation of my church in Grand Rapids, Michigan, and so many other churches in our community and across the country, continues to sing these spirituals. They inspire in us the human struggle for freedom and remind us of the lessons of history.

I am honored to stand here today in support of House Resolution 120 to express the deepest gratitude and recognition to the former enslaved African Americans for their gifts to our Nation, including their spiritual music and oral history. I ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DeLAURO) for 5 minutes.

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of legislation that would recognize the African American spiritual as a national treasure, and would like to say thank you to my colleague from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) with whom I introduced this legislation in the Congress, as well as my colleagues on the floor this morning, the gentlewoman from California and the gentleman from Michigan, and also the chairman, Mr. MILLER, for bringing the bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, even though they sprang from one of the darkest periods of our Nation's history, a period of turmoil that Americans still live with to this day, as we all know, African American spirituals have inspired many of America's most remarkable and enduring musical accomplishments. Name the modern music form, and it owes a debt to the spiritual. Jazz, blues, rock and roll, gospel all trace their origins to this particular musical heritage. Today people around the world play, listen to, and find the deepest of inspiration in the music of Africans who lived their lives in slavery.

In so many ways this is a uniquely American music, one born of our uniquely American experience, reminding us who we are, where we come from, and all that we are capable of as a society and as a Nation.

The African American spiritual is as poignant and powerful a genre of music as any in history. And throughout history the African American spiritual has been kept alive through that oral tradition. For certain, this was so before the abolition of slavery in 1865 when these songs provided comfort and an outlet for spiritual yearning for so many, but also in the years immediately following abolition when few wished to sing African American spirituals, so acute was the pain and anguish they called to mind.

Thankfully there were some who recognized in the power of these songs the collective experiences from which they came and their intrinsic cultural and musical value. And by the late 19th and early 20th century, the spiritual was kept alive by churches and singing groups like the Fisk Jubilee Singers, who traveled and performed these remarkable pieces in the face of hostility and intolerance. Indeed, in 1872, the Jubilee Singers sang at the World Peace Festival in Boston and were invited to perform at the White House that year by no less than President Grant himself.

Today African American spirituals are not only performed in spirituals and concert halls across the world, they are also studied by sociologists and musicologists across the country. The University of Denver's Spirituals Project puts it aptly in its mission statement: "Spirituals uplift in times of crisis, heal, comfort, inspire, and instill hopes and dreams, thereby transforming individuals, communities, and whole societies."

And in much the same spirit of the Fisk Jubilee Singers, I want to say thank you to a good friend, a musicologist himself, for bringing to my attention the need for the Congress to honor this vital piece of our national heritage, Calvin Earl. As the youngest of nine children in North Carolina, Calvin taught himself the guitar at age 7, forming his first rhythm and blues group while serving in the Army before spending several decades performing jazz and big band music. Since 1989, Calvin has dedicated himself to pre-

serving and sharing spirituals with a new generation of Americans. Traveling the country, he builds on the traditional words and melodies to illuminate the history and complexity of this unique art form.

It was from Calvin that I learned about this remarkable tradition, how spirituals enabled slaves to teach their children, record their history, and surreptitiously communicate with one another. Indeed, songs such as "Wade in the Water," "The Gospel Train," and "Swing Low, Sweet Chariot" all reference the Underground Railroad. Another, "Follow the Drinking Gourd," even contained a coded map to the Underground Railroad. As these songs were spontaneous, their authors are not known, though they were the inspiration for the writers of the first gospel songs, from Charles Albert Tindley to Harry Thacker Burleigh to John Rosamond Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, no less than Frederick Douglass remarked that such spirituals "told a tale of woe which was then altogether beyond my feeble comprehension. They were tones loud, long, and deep. They breathed the prayer and complaint of souls boiling over with the bitterest anguish. Every tone was a testimony against slavery and a prayer to God for deliverance from chains."

Indeed, in so many ways the African American spiritual embodies who we are as Americans. The impact it has made on the cultural heritage of America, and indeed every American, is incalculable. I thank all who have allowed us to bring this resolution for consideration today. I urge my colleagues to support honoring this national treasure and this timeless reminder of the enduring human spirit.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SIREs) for 2 minutes.

Mr. SIREs. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 120, which recognizes the African American spiritual as a national treasure. The slave Africans who came to the European colonies were forbidden to speak their native languages, use African musical instruments, or practice their spiritual beliefs. To keep their African traditions alive through songs and stories, the slaves created a new kind of music. Today these are known as spirituals.

Mr. Calvin Earl, my constituent from Jersey City, has devoted his entire life to educating people about the history and the importance of African American spirituals. He started a program called The Gifts from My Ancestors. Through songs, dances, and storytelling, this program has helped people experience the story of enslaved African Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Mr. Earl for his work, and I believe it is time to recognize the importance of these spirituals and preserve them for future generations by voting in favor of H. Res. 120.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for 2 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding. I rise in strong support of H. Res. 120, recognizing the African American spiritual as a national treasure.

Growing up in the rural South in the 1950s, we grew up on what was then called the Negro spiritual, and many of these songs, of course, had great meaning, especially the lyrics. I remember, "Follow the Old Man" that is "Coming to Carry Me to Freedom" if you "Follow the Drinking Gourd." Well, gourds supposedly grew northward, and if you followed the direction of the gourd, you would get out of the slave South back during slavery and the abolitionist period, and you would be headed north. And so not only did these songs sound good, not only were they spiritually uplifting as one that I heard on this past Sunday at the Second Baptist Church in Maywood, Illinois, but they also were didactic; they were teaching and inspirational.

So I commend the gentlewoman from Connecticut for her introduction of this great resolution and urge its support.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER) for 2 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding.

I would like to lend my voice and praise of the African American spiritual and a group that I consider to be the leading practitioners of today and for the last 135 years, namely the Fisk Jubilee Singers.

As the Representative from Nashville, Tennessee, I have the honor of representing Fisk University, which, under the able leadership of President Hazel O'Leary, is achieving new heights and excellence. The Fisk Jubilee Singers have been there since 1871, singing some of the most beautiful music in the world and a music that is laden with a God-given message.

No other music that I am familiar with covers the range from agony to inspiration, from the depths of human misery and despair all the way up to religious bliss. This is remarkable music, and I would suggest to you if you haven't heard the Fisk Jubilee Singers sing it under the able direction of Dr. Paul Kwami, you have not fully lived. This is a truly remarkable group and a remarkable inspirational message.

So let's praise today the anonymous African American genius that has allowed these songs to flourish and survive some of the toughest conditions on our planet, and let's honor groups like the Fisk Jubilee Singers that keep that tradition alive and fresh for each new generation. Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is truly a national treasure. We need to

honor and preserve it and spread its wonderful message all around the world. The African American spiritual is part of God's great heritage.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that today this House will honor one of America's oldest and most unique cultural treasures, the African American spiritual. No music in the world communicates as much as the African American spiritual. It is music borne of suffering. Music that expresses anguish, unity, and hopeful transcendence. Our reverence and deep gratitude for this music is only surpassed by our shame over the conditions that gave it rise. What we are doing today is wholly appropriate—and long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly proud to represent Fisk University, a fine American college with a tremendous sense of history and purpose. Fisk was founded in the wake of the Civil War to educate all students, regardless of color. It was a costly and controversial mission, and in order to keep the school's doors open, a group of students embarked on a fundraising tour in October 1871. This choral ensemble soon became known as the Fisk Jubilee Singers. They earned renown all over the world, singing for U.S. presidents and poets, European royals and American intellectuals alike.

But most of all, Mr. Speaker, in their 135 years of existence, the Fisk Jubilee Singers have exposed people across the globe to the African American spiritual. They have reminded us all of our country's shared history, and they have told, in vivid word and tune, the story of a People. From "Wade in the Water" to "Go Down, Moses," and many songs between and since, the African American spiritual is a vital piece of American culture. Today we honor that tradition and those groups who keep it alive—groups like the Fisk Jubilee Singers.

The word "jubilee," Mr. Speaker, rooted in the Hebrew Scriptures, came to signify the proclamation of freedom from slavery. Today let this House rededicate itself to that powerful message and to those who have lifted their voices to express the pain of bondage and redemptive promise of freedom—of jubilee—throughout our Nation's history.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It always amazes me how the Lord manages to turn evil to good. And this is a good example of that; how under the terrible abuse and sin of slavery came the beautiful spirituals that we are honoring in this particular resolution. It is a real national treasure. It is something that I grew up with.

I recall my family, in which we had a number of musicians. Very frequently we were singing Negro spirituals, and in groups at church we would sing Negro spirituals, and yet look where this music came from, out of the terrible black mark on the history of this country when we had slavery over half the Nation. And yet the human response guided by God came out of these people and produced this beautiful, beautiful music. It is a heritage we all have, it is a heritage we must enjoy and, above all, a heritage that we must honor, as we are honoring in this resolution today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to close on House Resolution 120.

□ 1145

I want to thank my colleagues for their eloquence in speaking to this resolution. Truly, the African American spiritual is a national treasure. It must be embraced as such, enjoyed and enhanced, always in our thoughts and in our history because it has played such a critical part to so many thousands and thousands and thousands of people. And so I thank everyone for being here today and for presenting that to us.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this resolution to recognize the African American spiritual as a national treasure.

Till the passage of the 13th Amendment, African American slaves were prevented from speaking their native languages, playing musical instruments they had used in Africa, and practicing their traditional religious beliefs. Despite attempts to strip away the history and identity of these individuals, they relied on a strong oral tradition to pass down stories and family narratives in the form of original songs, now known as spirituals.

These African American spirituals came to represent a part of history that many tried to silence through oppression and slavery. These songs are a part of the spirit that could not be destroyed by the institution of slavery. And while the spirituals we know today likely represent only a small portion of the total number, they remain an important link to the past as we teach new generations the meaning of our roots.

For African Americans, identifying their history and researching genealogy becomes challenging due to a lack of organized records. Many are left with piecing together records of their ancestors left from former slave owners. Through song we can identify with our past, and the African American spiritual is one of the few remaining bastions of African American tradition and history though art.

I urge my colleagues to honor our history by voting for this importance piece of legislation.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 120, to recognize the African American spiritual as a national treasure.

When slavery was introduced into the European colonies in 1619, the dark days that followed ignited the faith and hope of our ancestors that one day their descendants would live in freedom and helped them bear the unbearable burden of bondage.

To help our ancestors tolerate the incorrigible injustices they suffered as slaves, they gathered together in unity and sang spiritual songs. Their strong faith in God was displayed through song and gave them hope that they would one day be free from the bondage of slavery. There was a transportation that took place when those songs were sung, for that moment they were carried away with their tunes from the problems and injustices they faced in their daily lives and could sing aloud to God who they depended on for help.

Frederick Douglass, a fugitive slave who would become one of the leading abolitionists

of the United States, remarked that the spirituals, "told a tale of woe which was then altogether beyond my feeble comprehension; they were tones loud, long, and deep; they breathed the prayer and complaint of souls boiling over with the bitterest anguish. Every tone was a testimony against slavery and a prayer to God for deliverance from chains."

Unfortunately their plight for freedom from slavery would not end until 1865 when the United States ratified the 13th amendment to the constitution, but our fight for equality against injustices, though easier today, still carries on. The singing of these African American spirituals is just as much a part of America as our flag and should be celebrated and seen as a thread in the fabric of our rich and diverse nation.

Many slaves were not allowed to learn to read and write but they were allowed to have their faith and their song. It was these two things that became a foundation in the African American community and intertwined, was used as a method of survival, as a means to cope with human servitude and echoed their strong desire to be free. It was in these songs that an oral history of their plight was communicated to each other, taught to their children, recorded their sad history and healed their broken hearts.

The Old Negro spiritual is still alive today. The influence of these songs is felt in gospel and the many popular genres of music that evolved from gospel. African American spirituals spread all over the United States, and the songs we know of today may only represent a small portion of the total number of the spirituals that once existed.

I thank my colleague, Ms. DELAURO, for introducing this important legislation, to ensure that we celebrate, treasure and recognize the African American spiritual as a national treasure and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for H. Res. 120, which recognizes the African American spiritual as a national treasure. The African American spiritual is both an expression of culture and faith, and a symbol of the path to triumph in our democracy.

The African American spiritual originated with many cultures in Africa, and became one of the few forms of expression that the African slaves were able to maintain while held in bondage in America. The spirituals not only served to uplift, but also served as a secret code to direct those enslaved to freedom. Lyrics from songs like "Steal Away (to Jesus)" and "Wade in the Water" were guides for those who planned to escape and served as instructions to allow those escaping to avoid being traced by slave catchers. Spirituals such as "Follow the Drinking Gourd" were also means of secretly communicating maps and directions for escaping slaves to reach the network of the Underground Railroad. After the abolition of slavery in the United States in 1865, the African American spiritual remained an important expression of culture, faith, and social justice, especially during the Civil Rights movements across the Nation in the 1950s and 1960s.

And so today, also in honor of Black History Month, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the African American spiritual and the legacy left to us by those who fought for free-

dom and rights in this country for all citizens. The African American spiritual is not only testimony of history, but is a part of our national heritage.

Mr. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 120.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAMS UNDER SMALL BUSINESS ACT AND SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT OF 1958

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 434) to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 through December 31, 2007, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendments:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

#### SECTION 1. ADDITIONAL TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAMS UNDER THE SMALL BUSINESS ACT AND THE SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT OF 1958.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Section 1 of the Act entitled "An Act to extend temporarily certain authorities of the Small Business Administration", approved October 10, 2006 (Public Law 109-316; 120 Stat. 1742), is amended by striking "February 2, 2007" each place it appears and inserting "July 31, 2007".

(b) *EFFECTIVE DATE.*—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on February 2, 2007.

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 through July 31, 2007, and for other purposes".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today we will consider H.R. 434 as it came back to us from the Senate. This bill extends the authorization of the Small Business Administration and its programs through July 31,

2007. This short-term extension will ensure entrepreneurs continue to have access to the programs at the SBA that are designed to stimulate job creation and economic development throughout the United States.

Small businesses rely heavily on the SBA and its programs to start and run their ventures. As the sole Federal agency charged with assisting this Nation's 26 million small businesses, it is critical that the SBA is able to meet their needs.

While the original bill would have extended the agency until December 31, 2007, we will support this bill in order to ensure the agency's programs can operate through the end of July with no disruptions. As such, we move to pass H.R. 434 today.

I look forward to working with Ranking Member Steve Chabot to draft a bipartisan bill that will ensure the SBA can adequately and efficiently respond to the needs of entrepreneurs. Our Nation's main job creators, small businesses, deserve nothing less.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

This bill simply, as the chairwoman indicated, extends all the programs, including pilot programs, the authorities or provisions of the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act as they are presently constituted until July 31 of this year. The programs and authorities of the Small Business Administration expired on February 2. We would have preferred a longer extension, but the other body insisted on a shorter extension date of July 31.

Passage of this bill will hopefully give the Small Business Committees in both the House and the Senate the time necessary to work in a bipartisan manner on a more comprehensive SBA reauthorization bill.

Many of the programs of the SBA do not operate under a direct appropriation. This legislation will reaffirm their legality to operate, including the Advisory Committee on Veterans Business Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is quite simple. It contains the exact same language, with only the date changed, that passed the House last month by an overwhelming vote of 413-2.

Again, I look forward to working in a bipartisan manner with Chairwoman VELÁZQUEZ and other committee members to produce a good, fiscally responsible SBA reauthorization bill that can eventually be signed into law by the President. I especially want to thank Chairwoman VELÁZQUEZ for her graciousness in agreeing to bring up this bill in such a quick manner.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 434 with the Senate amendments so that our Nation's small businesses will see no interruption of service from the SBA over the next 5 months while we work to adopt a comprehensive reauthorization bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers at this time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. We also have no further speakers, and we yield back the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill, H.R. 434.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### HONORING THE LIFE OF BENNY PARSONS

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 69) recognizing and honoring Benny Parsons and expressing the condolences of the House of Representatives to his family on his death.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### H. RES. 69

Whereas Benny Parsons was born in Wilkes County, North Carolina, on July 12, 1941, and resided in the towns of Ellerbe and Concord, North Carolina in the Eighth Congressional District;

Whereas Benny Parsons was the son of Hazel and the late Harold Parsons and the brother of Steve, Phil and Patty;

Whereas Benny Parsons started racing in 1963 at the Mt. Clemens Speedway in Mt. Clemens, Michigan;

Whereas Benny Parsons was the Automobile Racing Club of America (ARCA) Rookie of the Year in 1965 and ARCA Champion in 1968 and 1969;

Whereas Benny Parsons was the first ARCA Champion inducted into the International Sports Hall of Fame;

Whereas Benny Parsons made his Winston Cup debut in 1970 and had his first Winston Cup victory at South Boston Virginia Speedway in 1971;

Whereas Benny Parsons was Winston Cup Champion in 1973;

Whereas Benny Parsons had an extraordinary career as a National Association for Stock Car Auto Racing (NASCAR) driver, winning 21 races, including the 1975 Daytona 500;

Whereas in 1982 Benny Parsons qualified for the NASCAR Winston 500 at Talladega Superspeedway at 200.175 miles per hour, the first NASCAR qualification run over 200 mph;

Whereas in 1998 Benny Parsons was named one of the 50 Greatest Drivers in NASCAR History;

Whereas after a successful career as a driver, Benny Parsons developed a successful career in broadcasting, further expanding his sport through his insight and commentary;

Whereas Benny Parsons was known for his kindness by all who had the good fortune to meet him;

Whereas Benny Parsons was a loving husband to his wife Terri and an exceptional father to his sons Kevin and Keith;

Whereas Benny Parsons was a man of strong faith and character; and

Whereas Benny Parsons passed away on January 16, 2007, prompting friend and

former competitor Darrell Waltrip to state that "Benny Parsons was the kindest, sweetest, most considerate person I have ever known. He was a great champion, a great ambassador for our sport but more than that, he was a great person. He exemplified that good guys can be winners too." Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes Benny Parsons as one of the greatest race car drivers ever to participate in the sport of auto racing and recognizes his many contributions to the Nation throughout his lifetime;

(2) honors Benny Parsons for transcending the sport of auto racing to become a role model as both a talented competitor and mentor and as a loving husband and father; and

(3) extends its deepest condolences to the family of Benny Parsons.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today we honor and remember the life of Benny Parsons and his contribution to the racing community. Mr. Parsons was a legendary NASCAR driver and TV analyst. His thoughtful insights as an announcer earned him the nickname The Professor, and his achievements as a driver include a Winston Cup NASCAR championship.

Born in Wilkes County, North Carolina, he developed a penchant for cars and racing with his father. At the age of 18, he moved to Detroit where he drove taxis and worked at a service station. Soon thereafter he started his NASCAR career. In 1971, he won his first race, and in 1973 won the NASCAR championship. Mr. Parsons battled with drivers like Richard Petty and Carl Yarborough throughout his racing career that stretched over 20 years.

After Parsons retired from racing in 1988, he became a commentator and a recognized voice for NASCAR. His work helped NASCAR become one of the most widely watched sports in America and taught many newcomers to understand and enjoy racing. Earlier this year Mr. Parsons succumbed to complications from lung cancer.

So I urge my colleagues to rise in support of H. Res. 69.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We are very sorry to hear about Benny Parsons losing his life and his

battle with lung cancer. He was a great race car driver, known to his friends as BP. He spent his early years in North Carolina, where he began his career in sports playing high school football.

Shortly after high school, his family moved to Detroit where his father ran a taxicab company. He helped his father and drove cabs and also worked at a local gas station.

In a town known as Motor City, Benny's interest and experience in automobiles and racing thrived. He quickly became a real huge race fan.

As the story goes, he lucked out when a truck towing a race car pulled into the station for a fill-up, and after talking with the truck driver, he was invited to join him on his way to nearby Mount Clemens Speedway. Once they arrived at the track, the race car driver who was supposed to drive the car did not show up, and so BP offered to drive the car, and that was his first race.

It is hard to believe that somebody would go from a gas station to a race car and get in it right away. I am from Indianapolis, Indiana. The Indianapolis 500 is driven there, and I cannot imagine anybody without any past experience getting into a race car and driving it and doing well, but BP did.

□ 1200

In 1964, Benny Parsons drove in his first official NASCAR race. Only a year later, he received the Rookie of the Year award from the Auto Racing Club of America, in one year. He would go on to win the ARCA championship in both 1968 and 1969. He had an impressive record in racing during 1971 and 1972, and his points earned him the NASCAR championship in 1973.

He also won the Daytona 500 in 1975 and the 1980 World 600 championship at Charlotte, and he continued on to win the National Speedway USA, the Texas World Speedway and his career final victory at the Coca-Cola 500 in Atlanta, Georgia. Overall, he had 283 top-10 finishes and won 21 major races.

After he finished his last race in 1988, he switched gears from driving to commenting. He started out reporting from the pits during his final years of racing but began full time for both ESPN and TBS in 1988. His firsthand knowledge of the sport captivated his audiences. He could talk from the perspective of both a fan and a driver, and was skilled at sharing his insights through his broadcasts.

As the NASCAR industry grew more popular and was televised more frequently, he commented for both NBC and TNT. Parsons received an ACE award in 1989 and an ESPN Emmy award in 1986. His talent as an announcer earned him the new nickname, The Professor. It is a long way from race car driver to professor, but he earned it.

When he spoke, audiences listened and learned from him. In the summer of 2006, Parsons began to have trouble breathing. His doctors diagnosed him

with lung cancer, even though he had quit smoking over 25 years ago.

After a successful treatment, he noticed more trouble breathing. Doctors found that his left lung had not fully recovered from the radiation. This past December, he reentered the hospital for treatment and passed away on January 16 of this year from complications from lung cancer.

His career encompassed four decades of racing, followed by nearly two decades of announcing. Among other awards, he was inducted into the International Motor Sports Hall of Fame in 1994, the Court of Legends at Lowe's Motor Speedway in 1994, and the Motor Sports Hall of Fame of America in 2005. In 1998, he was named one of NASCAR's 50 greatest drivers.

Benny Parsons, known for his lovable personality and his positive attitude, will be greatly missed by all of those in the NASCAR community and family.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all Members to join me by supporting this resolution. We have a NASCAR race, the Brickyard 400, in Indianapolis, and we are going to miss Benny Parsons there. We wish his family well.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers and would ask if the gentleman would want to yield back his time.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, we have one more speaker who is not yet here, but since he is not here, we would like to have permission to have his remarks put in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, we yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Indiana. This seems to be the day for Indiana and Indianapolis.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I would just ask my colleague from Illinois, isn't every day the day for Indiana?

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I would urge support for this resolution.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, may I reclaim my time? Mr. HAYES just arrived.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Indiana reclaims his time.

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES).

Mr. HAYES. I thank my friends DANNY DAVIS and DAN BURTON.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Benny Parsons, a friend, a true friend and a legend in the racing community. Benny passed away in January; a great loss to all our community.

Benny was born and raised in the foothills of North Carolina. After literally stumbling into the racing industry while working for his dad's service station in Detroit, Michigan, Parsons returned to Ellerbe, North Carolina in Richmond County to drive for car

owner L.G. DeWitt, a local businessman who also just happened to own the Rockingham race track.

Benny Parsons led a legendary career as a NASCAR driver, and he helped make the sport what it is today. From 1964 until his retirement in 1988, Benny made 526 starts. Benny Parsons was the first stockcar driver to go over 200 miles an hour, and he turned that speed into incredible success on the track. Benny won 21 major races, including the Daytona 500 and, in 1973, earned the highest honor in NASCAR, the Winston Cup.

Benny's work and contribution did not end on the race track. Upon his retirement from racing, Benny Parsons entered broadcasting, where he further expanded the sport through his insight and his down-home commentary. Benny was a fan favorite and became known as The Professor for his relaxed and uncanny style of commentary.

Besides being a champion and Hall of Famer, Benny Parsons was most revered by his colleagues and fans for his generous nature and lovable personality.

Benny told me he was always grateful for the support the people of Richmond County gave him. Despite his fame, my conversations with Benny seemed to flow around eating at the Dixie Burger and talking Raider football in Richmond County. He maintained a home there even after settling in my hometown of Concord.

To the people of North Carolina's Eighth District, Benny Parsons will always be a hometown boy as well as a champion. I ask that you join me today in extending your sympathy to Benny's wife, Terri; his sons, Kevin and Keith; and his entire family in the racing community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask to observe a moment of silence in honor of Benny Parsons' legacy of giving.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back for a life well lived.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina. We have no further speakers.

As I indicated earlier, NASCAR racing is one of the most watched sports in America, and I am amazed at the number of people who participate. I would urge passage of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 69.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## CONGRATULATING THE INDIANAPOLIS COLTS FOR WINNING SUPER BOWL XLI

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 130) congratulating the National Football League champion Indianapolis Colts for winning Super Bowl XLI and for bringing the City of Indianapolis and the State of Indiana their first Lombardi Trophy.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 130

Whereas on February 4, 2007, in Miami, Florida, the Indianapolis Colts defeated the Chicago Bears by a score of 29 to 17 in Super Bowl XLI to win the National Football League (NFL) Championship;

Whereas this is the first Super Bowl win for the Indianapolis Colts following an overall season record of 16-4 and a regular season record of 12-4;

Whereas the Colts won their fourth American Football Conference (AFC) South Title this year and the AFC championship title with a stunning come-from-behind 38-34 victory over the New England Patriots on January 21, 2007;

Whereas Tony Dungy, in his fifth season with the Colts, is the first African-American head coach to win the Super Bowl and is one of the most respected coaches in the league, cultivating Championship success for the team and boasting 10-plus victories and playoff appearances in his first four seasons with the Colts;

Whereas Colts Owner and Chief Executive Officer Jim Irsay, who assumed ownership of the Colts in 1997, has helped revitalize the Colts franchise along with Colts President Bill Polian whose name is synonymous with pro football success;

Whereas quarterback Peyton Manning, who had 25 completions for 247 yards, was selected as the Most Valuable Player (MVP) of Super Bowl XLI; and

Whereas the entire Colts franchise has become a model of professionalism, goodwill, and community service in representing the City of Indianapolis and the State of Indiana and brings pride to Hoosiers and Colts fans everywhere: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives congratulates the National Football League champion Indianapolis Colts for winning Super Bowl XLI and for bringing the City of Indianapolis and the State of Indiana their first Lombardi Trophy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I will defer my opening remarks, and first shall be first. And I am going to yield such time as she might consume to the first lady of Indiana, Representative JULIA CARSON, who is the sponsor of this resolution.

Ms. CARSON. I do thank you very much, Representative DAVIS, for your courtesy and your indulgence, especially being from Illinois, the Chicago Bears. And the Bears have been overcome by the Colts. If you watch the Animal Planet channel, you can see that the Colts are not to be pushed around. So I want to thank you very much for your courtesy.

I come to the floor today to join my colleague, DANNY BURTON. We have contiguous districts. I am fighting over mine because the Colts' headquarters and the team is in my district, but I am sure he doesn't mind that at all. I heard the wonderful remarks that he made yesterday about the Colts, about Tony Dungy and Bill Polian and Jim Irsay. I want to thank him for it.

I come today to congratulate the Indianapolis Colts, who are in my district. See, we have good things in my district. They are not all drive-by shootings. The Indianapolis Colts have made us extremely proud. Here is a man, Tony Dungy, who incurred major tragedy, who hung out about a week or two, and then he came back and got back on the plate. I admired him for that. He sets an example for a lot of our young kids to follow that your setbacks can be your setups and your stumbling blocks can be your stepping stones.

Tony Dungy was determined to lead. He lead in a very positive way. He could have stayed out, moaned and groaned about what had happened, but he didn't do that. He incurred his spirituality and kept on moving.

I heard somebody mention the NASCAR a few minutes ago. We lost Paul Dana in NASCAR out in Indianapolis, and he fought successfully to get race cars to use ethanol. In 2008, all the race cars of NASCAR will be fired up and fueled up by ethanol. I want to be sure and mention that.

I rise today to recognize the Indianapolis Colts, the Super Bowl champions. The path they took was not easy, but they made it look easy because they operated as a team. I think that is an illustration of what we can become if we operate in unison as a team. When one member faltered, two others would be there to fill the gap. And after a long season, they filled the gap on a rain-soaked field in Miami to claim the title of world champions. Tony Dungy, game MVP Peyton Manning and Robert Sanders have all earned the title of champions.

I am proud that Indianapolis was represented by a very classy team with character. In a day when so many athletes are questionable examples, this team shows that you can be an active citizen and a winner at the same time.

This is a championship of firsts. This is the first Super Bowl win for the Indianapolis Colts, and the first time an African American head coach led the team to an NFL title.

Congratulations, Indianapolis Colts, and team owner Jim Irsay and President Bill Polian and all those who have

supported this team through the years. I want to thank Lovie Smith, class act; Chicago Bears; and all my friends in Chicago for a wonderful Super Bowl.

You go, Colts.

I yield back to DANNY, and I won't take my district away from him right now.

Thank you, Mr. BURTON.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

You know, there are a lot of reasons to thank Tony Dungy and Peyton Manning and the whole team for the great victory they had last Sunday. I sat in the rain for about 5 hours and watched them, and I didn't feel a drop of rain because they did such a great job.

I might have felt a drop of rain in the first part when Devin Hester ran 92 yards for the opening kickoff touchdown. It kind of scared everybody to death who were Colts fans, but we all had faith in Peyton Manning and the Colts, and we knew that they wouldn't give up, especially after watching them coming back from the biggest deficit in championship history to defeat New England 2 weeks before.

But the reason I want to thank them today is for my Illinois colleagues. I want Coach Dungy and Peyton Manning and the whole team to know, from my colleagues in Illinois, I want a deep-dish pizza, a pound of cheese cake and a bunch of DVDs for our troops over in Iraq. So I want to thank them very much for making sure I didn't have to pay for all that other stuff, but my colleague on the other side of the aisle does.

Let me be serious for just a moment. We are very, very thrilled to have a Super Bowl champion in Indianapolis, we waited for a long, long time. And it came at a time when we had some of the finest people that have ever been on a football team playing in Indianapolis. It came at a time when we had one of the finest coaches who ever coached football in Indianapolis. And not only is Tony Dungy a great coach, but he is a great American and a very patriotic man and a good Christian fellow. And everybody in Indianapolis really respects him.

Peyton Manning has been a gentleman on and off the field. The whole team has. I can name everybody on the team. And I just want to say, on behalf of the Congress, me and JULIA CARSON, my colleague who represents Indianapolis, and STEVE BUYER and others, that we are very, very proud of the Colts. We hope they bring us another Super Bowl next year, but even if they don't, we are very, very thrilled. They have done Indianapolis proud, and we are very proud to talk about them here today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1215

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is obviously a bitter pill to swallow, especially given the fact that I represent the Chicago Bears, who happen to be in my district, the stadium that they use. We were anticipating great thrills and great delights, and for a brief moment we did, in fact, have that. But then someone said to me that we came in like lions and went out like lambs.

I guess that is exactly what happened. This past Sunday, Tony Dungy and the Indianapolis Colts beat Lovie Smith and his Chicago Bears 29-17 in a wet Super Bowl XLI.

The slippery conditions made for several muffs and miscues throughout the game, including a Romo-like botched hold during the extra point after the Colts' first touchdown.

The Bears got off to a quick start with Devin Hester returning the opening kickoff for a TD, and Rex Grossman hitting Muhsin Muhammad with a 4-yard pass in the first quarter for another seven points.

After this the Bears' offense sort of fizzled, and the Colts took advantage with Peyton Manning leading several drives that ended in Adam Vinatieri's field goals and a TD pass to Reggie Wayne. Joseph Addai and Dominic Rhodes also both contributed some hard runs with a combined rushing total of 190 yards and a touchdown. On the other side of the ball, the Colts were the better defense, causing five turnovers.

As noted last week, this game made history with two African American coaches facing each other for the title, and Tony Dungy being the first black coach to win a Super Bowl.

Of course, I want to congratulate Coach Dungy on a job well done, and adding to the celebration of Black History Month. I also want to commend Peyton Manning for his leadership of the team. I want to thank Representative CARSON's staff for their hard work, especially Kathleen Taylor, who did such a quick job of putting all of this together so that we did not have to delay.

And so with serious regret on the part of the Chicago Bears, I commend and congratulate the Indianapolis Colts and urge support for this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it sure is nice to hear the gentleman from Illinois extol the virtues of the Indianapolis Colts. I really appreciate that, DANNY.

I am very happy to yield to my colleague from Indiana, another great Colts fan, Congressman STEVE BUYER, 2 minutes.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to stand here to honor the Indianapolis Colts and Super Bowl champions. The Colts are a team that I believe represent the best of professionalism and goodwill.

My congratulations to Tony Dungy for his accomplishments in leading the



Colts to an overall season record of 16-4 and for becoming the first African American head coach to win a Super Bowl. I am most hopeful that such reference does not have to be made in the future. That is the goodness of America. Coach, you have also demonstrated that nice guys can win.

I also commend the passionate Indianapolis Colts who braved single-digit temperatures to welcome back home for the first time to the city of Indianapolis and the State of Indiana the Vince Lombardi Trophy.

Mr. Speaker, I also learned something, though, that I think America should know about the Super Bowl. You see, the teams that actually play the Super Bowl actually get 17 percent of the tickets. Those tickets go to those fans of the two teams, and they are upper deck, end zone seats, which means that all of the prime seats of the Super Bowl go to all of the other owners. So what I am most hopeful is that America takes note here that actually the fans of the teams that get to play the Super Bowl really do not get to see much of their team in a Super Bowl. And so what happens here is the city who wants a Super Bowl in their city, they trade seats for votes. And so it is like, hey, if I want the Super Bowl in Detroit, and you are the team owner in Detroit, I will give you 1,500 seats at the 35-yard line.

By the end of the first quarter with all of the rain, you had over 10,000 empty seats. You say, what happened to the fans? Well, those are people there who wanted to see a football game, but do not necessarily like to sit in the rain because they didn't like either team.

So we need to redo how they do the Super Bowl and actually sit the fans where they can enjoy the game. So hopefully that is taken into account.

To Coach Dungy, the entire team, the owner Jim Irsay, the dedicated staff of the Colts organization and thousands of Colts fans, I offer my congratulations to the Colts for the Super Bowl victory over my father's beloved Chicago Bears. Go Colts.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, of course maybe the NFL could learn from the House and realize that there should be no trading of seats for votes, and that would make the disposition a bit different.

I yield 3 minutes to Representative BRAD ELLSWORTH from Indiana.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my congratulations to the Super Bowl champions, the Indianapolis Colts. The NFL season came to a triumphant close Sunday night in Miami. But I am most proud that the Colts began their history run to this Super Bowl in Indiana's Eighth District last August on the training fields of Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology in Terre Haute, Indiana.

On Sunday, Coach Dungy, along with Lovie Smith of the Bears, became the first African American head coaches to walk the sidelines on the Super Bowl.

As the clock expired and the scoreboard read 29 for the Colts and 17 for the Bears, a rain- and Gatorade-soaked Dungy made NFL history again by becoming the first African American to win the Lombardi Trophy.

After a sloppy start in a rainy Miami that included a kickoff returned for a touchdown and an interception by the Bears, the Colts found themselves in an early hole. But the Dungy-led team refused to give up and charged back to take a 16-14 halftime lead, with Reggie Wayne and Dominic Rhodes providing touchdowns.

The Colts dominated the second half of the game on both sides of the ball, surrendering only three points while bolstering their lead. Cornerback Kelvin Hayden, who was playing in place of injured starter Nick Harper, put the game nearly out of reach in the fourth quarter when he intercepted Rex Grossman's pass and returned it for 56 yards for a touchdown.

Safety Bob Sanders, who forced a fumble earlier in the game, clinched it on the ensuing drive with an interception of his own, and Colts kicker Adam Vinatieri, the NFL's all-time leader in career Super Bowl field goals, contributed the remainder of the team's scoring.

I am proud to congratulate the Super Bowl MVP Peyton Manning. With his performance, Manning silenced all of the critics who throughout his career claimed that he could not win the big game. They do not get any bigger than this.

Manning threw for 247 yards and a touchdown, while leading his team to victory. Manning was aided in the backfield by the two-pronged running attack of Rhodes and rookie Joe Addai, who combined to rush for 190 yards.

The Colts excelled on the field at the Super Bowl, but what makes it truly a pleasure to cheer for is the dignity and class the team displayed throughout the season. I believe that this starts at the top with Coach Dungy. Karen Crouse of the New York Times summed up the Colts' coach best when she wrote, and I quote, "Dungy has the most victories of any NFL coach since 1999 with a record of 90-38. But the bottom line is not what defines him. His life has been about opening people's eyes so they may see talent and not skin color; spirituality and not celebrity; integrity and not self-interest. He has helped a lot of people see more clearly," and I could not agree more. Go Colts.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to another great Colts fan, Congressman MIKE PENCE.

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in this bipartisan gathering with thanks to the leadership of Congresswoman JULIA CARSON to congratulate the world champion Indianapolis Colts. I congratulate the gentlewoman from Indianapolis for her leadership on this resolution and its eloquent drafting.

As others of my colleagues have suggested, the Colts' victory was not just a demonstration of athletic prowess, but it was a moment where I think the world got to see a little bit of Indiana on the world stage. They got to see the kind of serious work ethic, humility, commitment to getting the job done without a lot of flash and a lot of fanfare that really characterizes the people of Indiana.

As Congressman BURTON said, I also had the privilege, along with my wife Karen, of witnessing some history, not only the first world championship to come to Indianapolis, but also I saw the first African American coach lead a team to the Super Bowl, and to see two great teams led by two African American coaches shatter that glass ceiling, that for reasons of culture and habit had somehow been long established, in that stadium for that great championship game.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it is said that attitude reflects leadership, and I believe that Coach Tony Dungy really personifies just the type of leadership that deserves rewarding in the NFL and is heralded in the State of Indiana.

Let me say that Coach Dungy should be admired not only for that calm, steady leadership on the sidelines, but also his career off the field is equally impressive. Since his time in Tampa Bay, he brought his commitment to Christian values to young people through the Fellowship of Christian Athletes. He launched Mentors for Life, a program that provided tickets to young people for home games and their mentors. And I was there about a year ago when Coach Dungy, one of many such occasions around the country, spoke in Anderson, Indiana, to a stadium full of young people about his profound faith in Christ and about his belief in the relationship of character to success.

But we also celebrate Peyton Manning, the man awarded with Most Valuable Player in the Super Bowl, and of course now a man who others have said has minted his reputation as one of the greatest quarterbacks of all time. He personifies a humility and a work ethic that I believe are rightly celebrated.

Let me close by saying, as Peyton Manning remarked on being selected MVP, he said, "I am excited, but I am proud to be on this team."

I would like to close my remarks today by asking unanimous consent to add to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the names of all of the members of the Colts' offense, defense, substitutions and the coaching staff, because this truly was a team effort. It was men and women in the head offices, and on the fields, on the training staff, and the catching staff that brought this world championship home to our capital city. They have our praise, our congratulations.

Offense: Reggie Wayne—Wide Receiver, Tarik Glenn—Offensive Tackle, Ryan Lilja—Offensive Guard, Jeff Saturday—Center, Jake Scott—Offensive Guard, Ryan Diem—

Offensive Tackle, Dallas Clark—Tight End, Marvin Harrison—Wide Receiver, Peyton Manning—Quarterback, Joseph Addai—Running Back, and Ben Utecht—Tight End.

Defense: Robert Mathis—Defensive End, Anthony McFarland—Defensive Tackle, Raheem Brock—Defensive Tackle, Dwight Freeney—Defensive End, Cato June—Linebacker, Gary Brackett—Linebacker, Rob Morris—Linebacker, Nick Harper—Defensive Back, Jason David—Defensive Back, Antoine Bethea—Defensive Back, and Bob Sanders—Defensive Back.

Substitutions: Adam Vinatieri—Kicker, Terrance Wilkins—Wide Receiver, Hunter Smith—Punter, Kelvin Hayden—Defensive Back, Marlin Jackson—Defensive Back, DeDe Dorsey—Running Back, Dominic Rhodes—Running Back, Dexter Reid—Defensive Back, Matt Giordano—Defensive Back, Justin Snow—Tight End, Rocky Boiman—Linebacker, Keith O'Neil—Linebacker, Freddy Keiaho—Linebacker, Tyjuan Hagler—Linebacker, Dylan Gandy—Offensive Guard, Dan Klecko—Defensive Tackle, Bo Schobel—Defensive End, Charlie Johnson—Offensive Tackle, Bryan Fletcher—Tight End, Aaron Moorehead—Wide Receiver, Josh Thomas—Defensive End, and Darrell Reid—Defensive Tackle.

Coaching Staff: Tony Dungy—Head Coach, Jim Caldwell—Assistant Head Coach/Quarterbacks, Clyde Christensen—Receivers Coach, Leslie Frazier—Special Assistant to Head Coach/Defensive Backs, Richard Howell—Assistant Strength Coach, Gene Huey—Running Backs Coach, Ron Meeks—Defensive Coordinator, Pete Metzelaars—Offensive Quality Control, Tom Moore—Offensive Coordinator, Howard Mudd—Offensive Line Coach, Mike Murphy—Linebacker Coach, Russ Purnell—Special Teams Coach, Diron Reynolds—Defensive Quality Coach, John Teerlinck—Defensive Line Coach, Ricky Thomas—Tight End Coach, Jon Torine—Strength and Conditioning Coach, and Alan Williams—Defensive Backs Coach.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY).

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Congresswoman CARSON on her resolution, to add my name to it, and to also say I come from a unique place, and that my district is not far from Chicago. Our beautiful district has numbers of Bears fans in it as well as Colts fans. And so to the Bears fans from Michigan City, Laporte, and South Bend, I say a season well done; one step short is still a heck of a year. We are incredibly proud of the Bears, but we are also beaming about our world champion Indianapolis Colts who did it in a way to reflect what our State's values are: dignity, hard work, class, and a never-give-up attitude.

To Peyton Manning, to Joseph Addai, to all of the outstanding players, and especially to Coach Tony Dungy, Tony Dungy and Lovie Smith come from a long tradition of fine men like Sherm Lewis, men like Eddie Robinson, and to see Tony Dungy as the first African American coach to win the Super Bowl was a tremendous moment. But he will not be the last. There will be many, many more. But his name will be etched in history forever. And as a man, we can only look at Tony and hope that we can be as fine in image and in value to our sons and daughters as he has been to all of us.

Hard work, nonstop class, I am proud to be from our beloved State and proud of our world championship Super Bowl champion Indianapolis Colts.

□ 1230

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to yield 3 minutes to another Colts fan who is a friend of Peyton Manning from Tennessee, the great Congressman from that State (ZACH WAMP).

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and everyone from Illinois and Indiana for bringing us to this moment.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to represent the State of Tennessee in coming to congratulate the Indianapolis Colts. Few people would know this, but last Thursday here in Washington was our annual prayer breakfast, where we bring people from all around the world for our prayer breakfast. And Dr. Francis Collins of the Human Genome Project was the speaker, and he just did an extraordinary job.

But what people wouldn't know was that before we invited Dr. Francis Collins, we actually extended an invitation to Tony Dungy. But Tony Dungy knew when we extended that invitation where he was going to be the following Sunday, and he told us. Sorry, I can't come speak at the National Prayer Breakfast because I will be preparing to play in the Super Bowl. And boy, was he preparing.

Many people know the connections to Tennessee here with this Super Bowl because of Peyton Manning, because he played his college football at the University of Tennessee. And I dare say, other than the State of Indiana, and maybe Mississippi, the State of Tennessee was cheering for the Indianapolis Colts in greater numbers than any State in the Union because of Peyton Manning, because he is our favorite son because of where he played his college football.

To this very day, he owns real estate in Chattanooga. He plays his golf in Chattanooga. We see him a lot. He is married to a Chattanooga girl. We are very proud of that.

You wouldn't know also that R.V. Brown, who was the chaplain for the Tampa Bay Buccaneers, is one of Coach Dungy's closest friends and the person to whom we extended the invitation. We are so very proud of these relationships.

What about Lovie Smith? He coached at the University of Tennessee as well. So all of these great players and coaches that really represented the goodness of America on Sunday and in the days leading into Sunday have some kind of Tennessee connections.

But I just want to close with this thought. Proverbs 16:15 says this: Good-tempered leaders invigorate lives. They are like spring rain and sunshine.

And I have got to tell you that Tony Dungy and Lovie Smith are good-tempered leaders straight from that scripture. They have invigorated lives, and

they refresh and give life to this great Nation. We honor them today because of their leadership. We honor this team because of what they stood for. And we are grateful, frankly, that this brings the country together and lifts us to a new level.

Congratulations, Indianapolis Colts.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, now it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I was in my office just a few minutes ago watching, doing my work in my office, but I caught my colleagues talking about the victorious Indianapolis Colts, and I couldn't resist coming down here. I don't have any prepared remarks, but I want to come to the floor today to also extend my congratulations to the Indianapolis Colts.

My wife and my three daughters had the opportunity to see the Colts win the AFC championship at Indianapolis. And at the time, I thought it was good enough that we just made it to the Super Bowl. But that wasn't good enough for Peyton Manning and Marvin Harrison and the rest of the Colts and Tony Dungy. They wanted the ring. And they stepped up to the plate and took it to another level. And I watched in amazement how they held steady when the chips were down, especially when they were playing against the Patriots, and how they held steady when the Chicago Bears scored that touchdown right off the bat. They didn't panic. They showed true leadership, and I am so proud of the Colts, and I am proud of the fact that I had the opportunity to extend congratulations to them.

I think Marvin Harrison and Peyton Manning are the best one-two punch in the history of the NFL. These two players are magnificent athletes, but they are also magnificent human beings in who they are and how they lead. And I couldn't be more happy.

I also have to say something about the Chicago Bears. They are a great football team. We beat a great football team. And Rex Grossman, who is the quarterback of that team, has caught a lot of heat recently for what he did. But he took the Chicago Bears to the Super Bowl, and that is a feat in itself.

And I single him out because I believe it was his dad or his uncle that I actually played football against in Bloomington, Indiana, where Rex Grossman actually is. So I consider him a constituent. Bloomington is in my district. It is great to applaud him for his accomplishments. I applaud the Chicago Bears, and I applaud the Indianapolis Colts for all the good things that they have done for the State of Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire of my colleague, do you have any more speakers?

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. No, I don't believe we do.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Well, if he has no more speakers, I am prepared to

yield back the balance of my time. But I just want to say to my colleagues from Illinois, and I say this in a good-natured way, if you need a Colts hat, I just happen to have a few in my office. I will be very happy to buy you one.

But I still want my deep-dish pizza, my cheesecake, and I want to make sure those DVDs get to the troops in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, to close, I will just simply say that, of course, Eli's has the best cheesecake in the world, and Representative BURTON, you shall be able to partake of that.

But also, let me say that we will congratulate all of the players, all of the owners, all of those who made these two great teams. I have never seen two men who have given more to a sport than Tony Dungy and Lovie Smith. Not only are they masters of the game, not only are they great coaches and leaders, but they exemplify the best of human beings, the best that you could possibly be, and that is what they have done for the game of football. That is what they have done for America. And I am sure that Americans all over the Nation will be cheering them on for years and years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to Representative JULIA CARSON for the last word.

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that all of the delegation of Indiana has come to the floor to speak on behalf of this worthy resolution.

Tony Dungy, if you don't mind, I will single him out, exhibits the kind of character that we would all like our men to exhibit. Young men, who were jumping up and down at the Colts Super Bowl, can learn so much about how far you get in this world by displaying strength, by displaying honesty and integrity and loving the Lord. That is what Tony Dungy does.

He belongs to Northside New Era Church in Indianapolis, which is a little church on a hill. It is not a big, palatial church that swings around city blocks; just a little church on a hill. And the members there love him.

And I notice that he took many of the young people from Northside New Era to Miami, which was an experience that they will never replicate.

So I want to thank the Dungy family. His wife, when the church has an event, she is right there with her little apron on cooking, too.

So it shows you that you can't think too highly of yourself. And Tony Dungy certainly doesn't do that. He thinks highly of the Lord and of all the people that he serves. And I am just happy that I lived long enough to see this major event happen on behalf of the district that I represent.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 130.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ANTITRUST MODERNIZATION COMMISSION EXTENSION ACT OF 2007

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 742) to amend the Antitrust Modernization Commission Act of 2002, to extend the term of the Antitrust Modernization Commission and to make a technical correction.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 742

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Antitrust Modernization Commission Extension Act of 2007".

#### SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF TERMINATION.

Section 11059 of the Antitrust Modernization Commission Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 1 note) is amended—

(1) by striking "30 days" and inserting "60 days"; and

(2) by striking "section 8" and inserting "section 11058".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure cosponsored with me by the distinguished ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. LAMAR SMITH, to extend the Antitrust Modernization Commission by 30 days so that it may have time to wrap up and finalize its report and shut down its operations.

This modernization commission dealing with antitrust has been in existence since 2002 and was created with the purpose of examining whether the need exists to modernize the antitrust laws. It began meeting in 2004 and for the past 3 years has been studying many aspects of antitrust law, including how these laws operate in a modern, information-driven economy.

Also, they were charged with examining the intersection between antitrust law and intellectual property law; about immunities and exemptions that are enjoyed under our current antitrust law; the relationship between the Federal and State antitrust law enforcement; the application of antitrust laws in regulated industries; and the merger review process. I look forward to reviewing the commission's final report, which is due in April of this year.

I anticipate that the Judiciary Committee will take a close look at the recommendations contained in the re-

port and will continue to work with the commissioners even after the report is completed.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 742, the Antitrust Modernization Commission Extension Act of 2007.

Our Nation's first antitrust laws were enacted at the turn of the 20th century. The Antitrust Modernization Commission Act of 2002 created a commission to examine how to update our antitrust laws in light of the new technologies that have developed in recent years.

The Antitrust Modernization Commission, or AMC, was required to produce a report 3 years after the date of its first meeting on April 2, 2004.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that the AMC will submit its recommendations to Congress and the President by the statutory deadline of April 2, 2007.

The AMC is required to terminate 30 days after submitting its report. However, the commission has requested an extension of its authorization by an additional 30 days so that it can effectively conclude its operations. This additional 30 days will allow the AMC to properly archive its records and transfer property to other agencies.

Pursuant to that request, H.R. 742 extends the authorization of the AMC by 30 days and also makes a small technical correction to the original authorization statute. This bill will not delay the submission of the AMC's report to Congress nor will it require the appropriation of any additional funds.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to cosponsor this bill, along with the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, to allow the AMC to wrap up its important work without imposing any additional cost on the American taxpayer.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe I have any others who want to comment on this legislation, and so, because of that, I will yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to yield myself as much time as I may consume.

The reason we have this commission is because there are acknowledged, some problems that we need to examine in the area of antitrust law.

□ 1245

The antitrust laws were derived from the Sherman Act of over a century ago, and they are very important, and they have helped us in terms of developing an economy that is in some respects the envy of the entire planet.

But there has been so much activity in the antitrust area that there has been some concern whether or not we have gone overboard. This past year is the fourth largest in the history for

mergers. Since the Oracle merger, which the Department of Justice sued on and lost, the Department of Justice itself hasn't gone to trial to block a proposed merger in memory.

And we are having larger and larger mergers and acquisitions. They are troubling: SBC and AT&T, a \$16 billion-valued merger; AT&T and BellSouth, an \$86 billion merger; Verizon and MCI, an \$8.5 billion merger; Sprint and Nextel, \$36 billion; Cingular and AT&T Wireless, about \$47 billion worth of coming together; Kmart with Sears, Roebuck; Hewlett-Packard and Compaq; NBC Universal and NBC and Vivendi; Morgan Chase and Bank One; Procter & Gamble buys \$54 billion in new acquisition; the Bank of America with FleetBoston. We have got something that needs far more consideration.

And I want to praise the former chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin, who helped us create the special outside committee to aid us, and we look forward to their reports. And I join the gentleman from Texas in helping to develop the time needed for us to get the report.

We on the Judiciary Committee feel this is a hugely important subject. And we want to particularly praise the vice chairman of the commission, Attorney Jon Yarowsky, who himself was a former member of the House Judiciary staff for a considerable number of years.

Mr. Speaker, the bill we are considering today is a modest one, but I want to emphasize that the issue it relates to is of utmost importance.

For over a century, the antitrust laws have provided the ground rules for fair competition. They are our economic bill of rights. Antitrust principles are necessary to preserve competition and to prevent monopolies from stifling innovation. Competition produces better products, lower prices, and wider choices—all to the benefit of consumers.

The cornerstone premise of our antitrust laws is essentially a conservative notion: that free and unfettered competition will produce the best results for consumers. To the extent that anticompetitive conduct or conditions have hindered this healthy process, the antitrust laws are there to arrest those violations and remedy the competitive harms.

In the Sherman Act, we prohibit contracts or conspiracies that restrain trade, and exclusionary or predatory conduct that sabotages the efforts of rivals. For egregious violations, there are high fines and prison terms. There are also treble damages for victims.

And we have supplemented those protections in the Clayton Act, by giving the antitrust enforcement agencies the power to challenge anticompetitive mergers in their incipency, to prevent their harmful effects from ever taking place.

The competitive landscape in the United States has been undergoing dramatic change in recent years. Technological and market innovation has come at us at breakneck speed. We have witnessed a wave of consolidation in some of our key industries. According to Thomson Financial, this past year was the

fourth largest in history for mergers and acquisitions.

At the same time, we have also seen familiar and novel forms of exclusionary conduct that interferes with the enterprising efforts of competitive businesses to cultivate and serve customers.

The telecommunications industry is one key industry that has experienced significant consolidation. This year, AT&T acquired BellSouth Corp.—after just last year acquiring SBC—in a deal that creates a telecom behemoth with \$117 billion in revenue.

This has particular consequences in the area of net neutrality. For people who innovate in the area of technology, and for those who enjoy those innovations, this free and open access to the Internet has been a boon. New applications are being developed every hour and are able to be instantly distributed on the Web. These new applications—coupled with new content, such as broadband television—have the potential to offer a new array of choices to consumers.

Unfortunately, some telecommunications companies have a different vision for the Internet. They have floated the idea of charging websites for access. Those who pay will get faster and more reliable delivery of their content to web surfers. Those who do not will see the delivery of their content degraded.

The antitrust laws can help ensure that network neutrality, the bedrock of the growth of the Internet, remains in place.

In the media, the FCC's relaxed cap on ownership in national and local broadcast markets, and relaxed cross-ownership restrictions between broadcasters and newspapers, has enabled concentrated wealthy interests to control a large portion of the media in some areas. Consumers are thereby often deprived of a diversity of viewpoints and voices in news and entertainment.

Imagine a world where you wake up, read the local newspaper, turn on the television to watch the news, drive to work and listen to the radio, pass a few billboards containing advertisements, return home later at night and turn on your cable to watch a movie or some sports—only to find that each of those media outlets is owned by the same company. It may sound farfetched, but it is not. This is the world we are evolving into. In this world, instead of ten voices with ten different viewpoints, there may only be three. The antitrust laws may be our only hope of preventing this.

The story is even bleaker for independent broadcasters, and for minority participation in the media industry. As of 2001, minorities owned only 3.8 percent of the full-power commercial radio and television stations in the nation, and only 1.9 percent of TV stations. If ownership of the media is controlled by four or five conglomerates, minority-owned stations and programming that appeals to minority interests could become a thing of the past.

In the home appliance industry, Whirlpool Corp., the largest maker of home appliances, merged with Maytag Inc., the third largest. The deal cost \$1.8 billion and produced a company that manufactures much of Sears' Kenmore line as well as the brands Jenn Air, KitchenAid, Amana, and Magic Chef, and controls as much as 70 percent of the U.S. market for large home appliances such as washers and dryers.

In the oil industry, we've seen massive increases in gasoline prices. After Hurricane

Katrina, the Washington Post reported price increases of as much as 88 cents per gallon in a single day. Some stations in Georgia were reported to be charging as much as \$6 a gallon. In Illinois, prices reportedly shot up 50 cents per gallon overnight, and the state attorney general received more than 500 reports of price gouging. At first blush, it would seem that these increases go far beyond anything justified or relating to the market disruptions caused by Hurricane Katrina. The FTC's report on this phenomenon was less than satisfactory.

We have also seen significant consolidation in the health insurance industry. In recent years, Aetna agreed to acquire Prudential Health Care, the fifth largest for-profit health care company, at the same time it was in the midst of completing its purchase of New York Life. In 1996 Aetna was also permitted to acquire U.S. Health Care. As a result of these acquisitions, Aetna became the largest health care provider in the nation.

Recent years have seen more than a dozen health insurance competitors eliminated through mergers and acquisitions. A study of market concentration by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation found that "both the group and individual [health insurance] markets are heavily dominated by a relatively few large insurers." Business consumers of health care have become increasingly alarmed by this concentration, with Charles Blankenstein, a health expert at William Mercer Consulting, warning that employers are "bear[ing] the cost of these acquisitions" as "choice in the marketplace is rapidly diminishing."

In the airline industry, lagging profits have led to a marked trend toward further consolidation. Because air travel is a vital portion of the nation's transportation infrastructure, we can't simply turn a blind eye and chalk this up to economic bad times. Often these mergers have the potential to reduce the flight options available to consumers, and ultimately may lead to higher ticket prices.

In this environment, vigorous antitrust enforcement is particularly important. We need to be able to rely on the federal antitrust enforcement agencies—the Antitrust Division in the Department of Justice, and the Federal Trade Commission. We need to be able to have confidence that they are doing everything they should to protect competition in our economy and the benefits it brings to us all.

That is why active oversight of antitrust must and will be an important part of the work of the Judiciary Committee. We will ask these agencies about merger enforcement, and why they do not seem to be challenging an mergers. We will ask them about their policy on civil non-merger enforcement against monopolization and other anticompetitive business arrangements. And we will ask them about their commitment to prosecute criminal antitrust violations.

The Committee will also create a task force, as we did in the last Congress, so that we can more closely examine competitive developments in important industries, including telecommunications, pharmaceuticals, and insurance, as well as topics such as interoperability of new technologies, credit card interchange fees, and transparency in standard setting.

As we prepare for the work ahead in this vital area, we will look forward to reading the Antitrust Modernization Commission's final report, and reviewing its assessment of the state

of health of the laws we rely upon to preserve our economic liberty.

I thank the Antitrust Modernization Commission for all its work over the past few years. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 742.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1334

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POMEROY) at 1 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.

## GERALD W. HEANEY FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE AND CUSTOMHOUSE

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 187) to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse and customhouse located at 515 West First Street in Duluth, Minnesota, as the "Gerald W. Heaney Federal Building and United States Courthouse and Customhouse".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 187

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

### SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The Federal building and United States courthouse and customhouse located at 515 West First Street in Duluth, Minnesota, shall be known and designated as the "Gerald W. Heaney Federal Building and United States Courthouse and Customhouse".

### SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building and United States courthouse and customhouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Gerald W. Heaney Federal Building and United States Courthouse and Customhouse".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

For me, today is a very fulfilling, as well as nostalgic, moment to move this bill to designate the Federal building and the U.S. courthouse and customhouse in Duluth for Judge Gerald W. Heaney.

He was appointed judge of the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit on November 3, 1966. He took senior status in December 31, 1988; finally retired last August after 40 years on the bench. But that is only part of the story.

Gerald Heaney was born January 29, 1918, in Goodhue, a rural community in southeastern Minnesota. He grew up in a farming community, learned the values of rural America, went to my college which I attended many years later, College of St. Thomas, where he graduated and went on to the University of Minnesota where he got his law degree in 1941, but then started a new chapter in the life of Gerald Heaney.

He enlisted in the Army in World War II. He was trained as a United States Army Ranger, and he was on the landing craft at 6:30 in the morning on Omaha Beach in Normandy.

I interviewed Judge Heaney for the Library of Congress project on World War II veterans. They are attempting at the Library to get the personal views of those who participated in World War II, and he told this story:

"We were all herded into the landing craft. At 6:30 we arrived close to the beach. We could not quite get into the beach because of the obstacles that the Germans had placed under water and also had proximity bombs that would blow up ships. They were having trouble getting the vessels in, so they could not get to the beach, but they got into relatively shallow water. And the door went down on the landing craft, and the captain stood up and said, everyone ashore, and he was cut down by gunfire. And the first lieutenant stood up and said, everyone ashore, and he was cut down by gunfire. And then," said Judge Heaney, "that left me, Second Lieutenant Gerald Heaney, in charge, and I looked up and said, we are not going out that door; everybody over the side."

How many lives he saved we will never know, but they got into water that was too deep for them to touch the bottom. They tried to swim. They were sinking. They all cut off their backpacks loaded with their food and supplemental ammunition and made it to the shore.

I was privileged to be in the group of Speaker HASTERT on the 60th anniversary of D-Day and stood at that beach, at that shoreline, and looked up at where the German gun emplacements were located. It is an awesome crossfire site, fearsome.

Men were cut down right and left as they crawled and inched their way up. By 3:30 in the afternoon, they had made progress of just about a mile, circled around the German guns, which was

their objective, and with hand grenades and other explosives, explosive packs, took out the German gun emplacements, making that segment of the beach safer for more landings.

By then they were out of ammunition. Judge Heaney said, I said to my men, and there were only a few of us left, we will go back to the beach; they will have landed supplies, and we can be replenished. So they turned around, and he stopped and choked and said, and that is when I saw the carnage, thousands killed.

But they returned, got supplemental ammunition, went back up that beachhead, and their job was to then circle around La Pointe du Hoc, which is a straight, rocky cliff. Rangers are going to scale La Pointe du Hoc from below, and Heaney and his Ranger group were to distract the Germans, take out the gunnery and make it safe, and they did. They attacked. They took out powerful German machine gun emplacements and long-range artillery.

For that heroism at La Pointe du Hoc, Judge Heaney was awarded the Silver Star, the second highest award our Government gives to our military personnel, but that was not the end. They continued all across France and into Germany.

By 1945, they had gotten to the Elbe, and there the British units, Russian units and American units met, but they postponed the formal meeting until the following morning where they would have a flag-raising ceremony. And as Judge Heaney said, he looked over, and the Russians had a flag, the British had a flag; he said, where is ours? They did not have a flag. No one had thought to bring a flag. They just fought their way courageously across Europe.

So Judge Heaney, Gerald Heaney, by then Captain Heaney, went into the village nearby and bought red, white and blue cloth and found seamstresses in the village who could sew that into an American flag with 48 stars at the time. He still has that flag. He brought it with him for the Labor Day celebration this year at Park Point in Duluth, and there was not a dry eye in the crowd.

That is the man, that is the courage, that is the strength. He went on to be appointed a U.S. circuit court judge by Lyndon Johnson, and displaying the same courage that he showed for his country in defense of liberty and freedom, he presided over the case to desegregate the St. Louis school system. He wrote the opinion and has written a book about not only the opinion, but the 20 years that he presided over the continuing desegregation of the St. Louis schools in his capacity as circuit court judge. It is entitled, "Unending Struggle. The Long Road to an Equal Education in St. Louis," with Dr. Susan Uchitelle, who was a law clerk for Judge Heaney.

He writes, Our involvement in the St. Louis public school case over a period of 18 years convinced us that, after

having recused ourselves from further participation in the case, that we should write a history of education in St. Louis. Much has been written about education during the slave years, 1820 to 1865. No one has attempted to pull together the rich material written over the period from 1820 to the 1980s.

It is all compiled in this remarkable document of how one court case changed the lives of children, of generations of children, of an entire community, made life better for not only African Americans but all citizens living in St. Louis.

□ 1345

I know that as I have traveled to that city from time to time to meet people, Gerald Heaney is nearly revered. He is enormously respected. His courage and standing and his steadfastness, just as he pursued the German forces across France and Germany, he pursued justice in the name of all of our fellow citizens as a sitting judge.

It is most fitting that we should designate the courthouse where he spent a great deal of his office hours. Although his cases were heard in St. Louis, in the courthouse there, his office hours were in the Federal building and the courthouse and customhouse in Duluth, a venerable facility that was built during the Depression years and, like Judge Heaney's work, will withstand the test of time for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Though many have made light of the schedule we have had for the past few weeks, the grueling schedule of naming a lot of Federal buildings, it doesn't mean that any of these individuals are any less deserving or should not be honored.

Today in committee in the Transportation Committee, we named a courthouse in Missouri, my home State, after Rush Hudson Limbaugh, Sr., who practiced law in the State of Missouri for over 80 years and was highly revered. Today on the floor, we are honoring somebody that, going through his accomplishments and what he has done in life, is somebody that truly should be recognized.

H.R. 187, which was introduced by Representative OBERSTAR of Minnesota, chairman of the Transportation Committee, designates the Federal building and the United States courthouse and customhouse at 515 West First Street in Duluth, Minnesota, as the Gerald W. Heaney Federal Building and United States Courthouse and Customhouse. The building honors Judge Heaney's dedication to public service.

As the gentleman from Minnesota pointed out, he served with great distinction during the Army in World War II and acquired a law degree from the University of Minnesota law school after his time. Judge Gerald W. Heaney engaged in private practice then just after the war, from 1946 to 1966.

Judge Heaney's career as a judge began then in 1966 with an appointment to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit by President Lyndon B. Johnson. Judge Heaney had a reputation for championing equal justice for underprivileged and vulnerable citizens. Judge Heaney retired after 40 years of service on August 31, 2006.

I support this legislation, Mr. Speaker, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I want to say, once again, what a great privilege this is to author this legislation, bring it from the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, which I have the honor to chair, and bring it to the House floor and pay tribute to a truly great heroic American who served his country in war, in peace, on the bench and in the hearts of our fellow citizens.

In addition to my statement on the Floor today, I want to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this passage from "Unending Struggle: The Long Road to an Equal Education in St. Louis" by Judge Gerald W. Heaney and Dr. Susan Uchitelle:

Unless additional resources are provided to the St. Louis public schools, they will fail, leading to a demand by some parents for alternative educational opportunities. . .

Excellent public schools are essential in a democracy. Experience has demonstrated that urban city schools educate and will continue to educate most school-age children. Moreover, public schools have an obligation to educate all children—rich and poor, black, brown, and white, gifted or special. Unless children are well educated and well trained, they will be unable to take their place as full participants in our vibrant democracy.

Segregated housing, a long history of discrimination in education and employment, and the historic lack of opportunity for African Americans to participate fully and equally in all aspects of life make the task ahead a challenging one.

This is but one simple passage from the works of Judge Heaney. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 187.

H.R. 187 is a bill to designate the federal building and United States Courthouse located at 515 West First St., Duluth, Minnesota as Judge "Gerald W. Heaney Federal Building and United States Courthouse and Customhouse." Gerald Heaney was appointed Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit on November 3, 1966. He took senior status on December 31, 1988, and retired on August 31, 2006, after over 40 years of distinguished service to his country and the citizens of Minnesota. I rise in strong support of this bill.

Judge Heaney was born on January 29, 1918 in Goodhue, a rural community in the southeastern part of Minnesota. As a child growing up in a farming community Judge Heaney learned the value of a close family, honesty, and hard work. These qualities have marked not only his personal life but also his life as a public servant. He was educated at the College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, and received his law degree from the University of Minnesota in 1941.

Gerry Heaney is a decorated World War II veteran. He was a member of the distinguished Army Ranger Battalion and partici-

pated in the historic D-Day landing at Normandy. He was awarded the Silver Star for extraordinary bravery in the battle of La Pointe du Hoc in Normandy. He also received a Bronze Star and five battle stars.

At the end of the war Judge Heaney returned home and entered private practice in Duluth. During that time he was instrumental in improving the state education system, and served on the board of regents for the University of Minnesota. He was instrumental in helping develop for the Duluth school system the same pay scale for both men and women.

In 1966 he was appointed by President Johnson to the Eight Circuit Court of Appeals. In that capacity he has been a champion in protecting the rights of the disadvantaged. He was devoted to making sure that every person had an equal opportunity for an education, a job, and a home. He firmly believes the poor, the less educated, and less advantaged deserve the protection of the Constitution.

As a hard working, well prepared, and fair minded jurist he left his legal imprimatur on school desegregation cases, bankruptcy law, prisoner treatment, and social security law.

His public service is discerned by industry, brilliance, and scholarly excellence. His compassion and dedication to those of us who are the most disadvantaged is unparalleled.

Judge Heaney is most deserving of this honor. I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 187.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

#### REPEALING PROHIBITION ON USE OF CERTAIN FUNDS WITH RESPECT TO LOS ANGELES TO SAN FERNANDO VALLEY METRO RAIL PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 238) to repeal a prohibition on the use of certain funds for tunneling in certain areas with respect to the Los Angeles to San Fernando Valley Metro Rail project, California.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 238

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. REPEAL OF PROHIBITION.

The second sentence of section 321 of the Department of Transportation and Related



Agencies Appropriations Act, 1986 (99 Stat. 1287) is repealed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This bill will repeal a prohibition on the use of Federal transit funds for tunneling in certain areas for construction of the San Fernando Valley Metro Rail project in Southern California.

Many of us can remember the tragedy over 20 years ago caused by an explosion due to the buildup of methane gas, which ignited after accumulating over a long period of time, on the Third Street Corridor in the Wilshire-Fairfax District of Los Angeles. It just rocked the entire area. The explosion damaged a building structure, injured 22 people. A preliminary investigation pointed to the ignition of underground pockets of pressurized gas.

The incident raised a great many safety concerns related to tunneling in the area to build the Metro Rail system. The Los Angeles City Council created a task force at the time to investigate the explosion to determine the cause of the accident, to make recommendations to avoid further incidents.

The results of the investigation identified two methane risk zones to assure that the safety concerns on construction of that segment of the Metro Rail were fully addressed. A provision was included in the fiscal year 1986 transportation appropriations bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds until safety concerns had been properly addressed.

The gentleman who took that cause to the committee, to the House, the gentleman from California, my colleague, we were elected in the same year, 1974, Mr. WAXMAN, has been vigilant on this issue and vigorous in his pursuit of safety for the people of Los Angeles County.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you very much for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is noncontroversial. It relates to a situation in Los Angeles where prohibition was put in place to prevent tunneling in an area that has been designated as a high risk for methane gas explosions. The bill before us would repeal that prohibition about tunneling, because, at the request of Mayor Villaraigosa, we agreed to convene a panel of experts to assure us that it is technically feasible to handle the tunneling in a very safe manner, that the technology is there and that we need not fear the tunneling as we might have, appropriately so, in the mid-1980s.

In 2004, the L.A. City Council passed a motion urging reversal of this 1985

law, and in February of 2005, the LAMTA board renewed discussions of the subway expansion in this area.

I strongly support this legislation. There is no opposition to it. I appreciate the committee having reported out unanimously, and I would urge my colleagues in the House to agree with the proposal coming from the committee.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 238 is noncontroversial legislation. In the last Congress, it was reported unanimously by the House Transportation Committee and passed the House by voice vote.

H.R. 238 would repeal a law enacted in 1985 that prohibits subway tunneling in a part of Los Angeles I represent. I authored the 1985 legislation after a methane gas explosion demolished a Ross Dress-for-Less store in the Third and Fairfax area of Los Angeles.

After the explosion, serious safety concerns were raised about the city's plans to extend the subway in this area due to underground pockets of methane gas. In recent years, experts have indicated that technologies have been developed that could make tunneling in the area safe.

In 2004, the Los Angeles City Council passed a motion urging a reversal of the 1985 law, and in February 2005 the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority's board voted to renew discussions of the subway's expansion in this area.

As a result, I worked with Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa to select a panel of scientific experts to conduct an independent safety review. These experts made a unanimous determination in a November 2005 report that tunneling in the methane gas area can be done safely if proper procedures and appropriate technologies are used.

H.R. 238 simply lifts the Federal tunneling prohibition that has been in place since 1985. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 238 repeals a 21-year-old prohibition on the use of Federal transit funds to tunnel in the San Fernando Valley area west of Los Angeles.

In 1985, an explosion of naturally occurring methane gas blew up a department store in the Wilshire Boulevard Corridor in Los Angeles, injuring 22 people. As the gentleman from Minnesota aptly pointed out, concerned about the safety of tunneling in the area of Los Angeles, the city council created a task force to investigate the explosion. The task force identified methane risk zones along the Wilshire Boulevard Corridor.

The fiscal year 1986 transportation appropriations bill included a legislative provision that prohibits the use of Federal transit funds associated with the Los Angeles project for tunneling in or through an identified methane risk zone. The appropriations provision was written very broadly, binding future funds provided by Congress and affecting all parts of the Metro Rail subway project, including future extensions. The prohibition prevented any transportation planners in the Los Angeles area from considering any trans-

portation improvements that might involve tunneling in the very broadly congested Wilshire Boulevard Corridor.

For me, Mr. Speaker, the need for this bill to be passed simply highlights the dangers of legislating an appropriations bill. H.R. 238 undoes something that should never have been done in the first place. In November 2005, a panel of engineering experts reported that tunneling along the Wilshire Boulevard Corridor can be done safely if proper procedures and appropriate techniques are used.

This bill, H.R. 238, will repeal the current prohibition on tunneling in that corridor. This legislation was first introduced by Congressman WAXMAN in December of 2005 as H.R. 4653 and was passed by the House in September of 2006. However, the Senate failed to act on the legislation, which is the reason we are back here on the floor today.

I do support H.R. 238, and I urge its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I want to supplement the remarks of the gentleman from California, my colleague from Missouri, the ranking member on the subcommittee, that we now believe that the city council has resolved the issues. The mayor has put in place the process by which the tunneling can continue in all safety to both those doing the tunneling and those above ground and now advance the urgently needed transit project in Los Angeles into the San Fernando Valley area. So I urge the passage of H.R. 238.

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 238.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 365, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 120, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 482, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

METHAMPHETAMINE REMEDI-  
ATION RESEARCH ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 365.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 365, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 426, nays 2, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 78]

YEAS—426

Abercrombie	Clyburn	Goode
Ackerman	Coble	Goodlatte
Aderholt	Cohen	Gordon
Akin	Cole (OK)	Granger
Alexander	Conaway	Graves
Allen	Conyers	Green, Al
Altmire	Cooper	Green, Gene
Andrews	Costa	Grijalva
Arcuri	Costello	Gutierrez
Baca	Courtney	Hall (NY)
Bachmann	Cramer	Hall (TX)
Bachus	Crenshaw	Hare
Baird	Crowley	Harman
Baker	Cubin	Hastings (FL)
Baldwin	Cuellar	Hastings (WA)
Barrett (SC)	Culberson	Hayes
Barrow	Cummings	Heller
Bartlett (MD)	Davis (AL)	Hensarling
Barton (TX)	Davis (CA)	Herger
Bean	Davis (IL)	Herseth
Becerra	Davis (KY)	Higgins
Berkley	Davis, David	Hill
Berman	Davis, Lincoln	Hinchee
Berry	Davis, Tom	Hinojosa
Biggert	Deal (GA)	Hirono
Bilbray	DeFazio	Hobson
Bilirakis	DeGette	Hodes
Bishop (GA)	DeLauro	Hoeckstra
Bishop (NY)	Dent	Holden
Bishop (UT)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Holt
Blackburn	Diaz-Balart, M.	Honda
Blumenauer	Dicks	Hooley
Blunt	Dingell	Hoyer
Boehner	Doggett	Hulshof
Bonner	Donnelly	Hunter
Bono	Doolittle	Inglis (SC)
Boozman	Doyle	Inslee
Boren	Drake	Israel
Boswell	Dreier	Issa
Boucher	Duncan	Jackson (IL)
Boustany	Edwards	Jackson-Lee
Boyd (FL)	Ehlers	(TX)
Boyd (KS)	Ellison	Madler
Brady (PA)	Ellsworth	Napolitano
Brady (TX)	Emanuel	Neal (MA)
Brayley (IA)	Emerson	Neugebauer
Brown (SC)	Engel	
Brown, Corrine	English (PA)	
Brown-Waite,	Eshoo	
Ginny	Etheridge	
Buchanan	Everett	
Burgess	Fallin	
Burton (IN)	Farr	
Butterfield	Fattah	
Buyer	Feeney	
Calvert	Ferguson	
Camp (MI)	Filner	
Campbell (CA)	Forbes	
Cannon	Fortenberry	
Cantor	Fossella	
Capito	Fox	
Capps	Frank (MA)	
Capuano	Frank (AZ)	
Cardoza	Frelinghuysen	
Carnahan	Gallely	
Carney	Garrett (NJ)	
Carson	Gerlach	
Carter	Giffords	
Castle	Gilchrest	
Castor	Gillibrand	
Chabot	Gillmor	
Chandler	Gingrey	
Clarke	Gohmert	
Clay	Gonzalez	
Cleaver		

Latham	Nunes	Shuler
LaTourette	Oberstar	Shuster
Lee	Obey	Simpson
Levin	Olver	Sires
Lewis (CA)	Ortiz	Skelton
Lewis (GA)	Pallone	Slaughter
Lewis (KY)	Pascarella	Smith (NE)
Linder	Pastor	Smith (NJ)
Lipinski	Payne	Smith (TX)
LoBiondo	Pearce	Smith (WA)
Loeb	Pelosi	Snyder
Lofgren, Zoe	Pence	Solis
Lowey	Perlmuter	Souder
Lucas	Peterson (MN)	Space
Lungren, Daniel	Peterson (PA)	Spratt
E.	Petri	Stark
Lynch	Pickering	Stearns
Mack	Pitts	Stupak
Mahoney (FL)	Platts	Sullivan
Maloney (NY)	Poe	Sutton
Manzullo	Pomeroy	Tancredo
Marchant	Porter	Tanner
Markey	Price (GA)	Tauscher
Marshall	Price (NC)	Taylor
Matheson	Putnam	Terry
Matsui	Radanovich	Thompson (CA)
McCarthy (CA)	Rahall	Thompson (MS)
McCarthy (NY)	Ramstad	Thornberry
McCaul (TX)	Rangel	Tiahrt
McCollum (MN)	Regula	Tiberi
McCotter	Rehberg	Tierney
McCrery	Reichert	Towns
McDermott	Renzi	Turner
McGovern	Reyes	Udall (CO)
McHenry	Reynolds	Udall (NM)
McHugh	Rodriguez	Upton
McIntyre	Rogers (AL)	Van Hollen
McKeon	Rogers (KY)	Velázquez
McMorris	Rogers (MI)	Visclosky
Rodgers	Rohrabacher	Walberg
McNerney	Ros-Lehtinen	Walden (OR)
McNulty	Roskam	Walsh (NY)
Meehan	Ross	Walz (MN)
Meek (FL)	Roybal-Allard	Wamp
Meeks (NY)	Ruppersberger	Wasserman
Melancon	Rush	Berry
Mica	Ryan (OH)	Biggert
Michaud	Ryan (WI)	Bilbray
Millender-	Salazar	Bilirakis
McDonald	Sali	Bishop (GA)
Miller (FL)	Sánchez, Linda	Bishop (NY)
Miller (MI)	T.	Blackburn
Miller (NC)	Sanchez, Loretta	Blumenauer
Miller, Gary	Sarbanes	Blunt
Miller, George	Saxton	Weller
Mitchell	Schakowsky	Westmoreland
Mollohan	Schiff	Wexler
Moore (KS)	Schmidt	Whitfield
Moore (WI)	Schwartz	Wicker
Moran (KS)	Scott (GA)	Wilson (NM)
Moran (VA)	Scott (VA)	Wilson (OH)
Murphy (CT)	Sensenbrenner	Wilson (SC)
Murphy, Patrick	Serrano	Wolf
Murphy, Tim	Sessions	Woolsey
Musgrave	Sestak	Wu
Myrick	Shadegg	Wynn
Nadler	Shays	Yarmuth
Napolitano	Shea-Porter	Young (AK)
Neal (MA)	Sherman	Young (FL)
Neugebauer	Shimkus	

NAYS—2

NOT VOTING—7

Flake	Paul	Royce
Davis, Jo Ann	Norwood	
Hastert	Pryce (OH)	
Murtha	Rothman	

□ 1423

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING THE AFRICAN  
AMERICAN SPIRITUAL AS A NA-  
TIONAL TREASURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of sus-

pending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 120.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 120, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 426, nays 0, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]

YEAS—426

Abercrombie	Cole (OK)	Graves
Ackerman	Conaway	Green, Al
Aderholt	Conyers	Green, Gene
Akin	Cooper	Grijalva
Alexander	Costa	Gutierrez
Allen	Costello	Hall (NY)
Altmire	Courtney	Hall (TX)
Andrews	Cramer	Hare
Arcuri	Crenshaw	Harman
Baca	Crowley	Hastings (FL)
Bachmann	Cubin	Hastings (WA)
Bachus	Cuellar	Hayes
Baird	Culberson	Heller
Baker	Cummings	Hensarling
Baldwin	Davis (AL)	Herger
Barrett (SC)	Davis (CA)	Herseth
Barrow	Davis (IL)	Higgins
Bartlett (MD)	Davis (KY)	Hill
Barton (TX)	Davis, David	Hinchee
Bean	Davis, Lincoln	Hinojosa
Becerra	Davis, Tom	Hirono
Berkley	Deal (GA)	Hobson
Berman	DeFazio	Hodes
Berry	DeGette	Hoeckstra
Biggert	DeLauro	Holden
Bilbray	Dent	Holt
Bilirakis	Diaz-Balart, L.	Honda
Bishop (GA)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hooley
Bishop (NY)	Dicks	Hoyer
Bishop (UT)	Dingell	Hulshof
Blackburn	Doggett	Hunter
Blumenauer	Donnelly	Inglis (SC)
Blunt	Doolittle	Inslee
Boehner	Doyle	Israel
Bonner	Drake	Issa
Bono	Dreier	Jackson (IL)
Boozman	Duncan	Jackson-Lee
Boren	Edwards	(TX)
Boswell	Ehlers	Jefferson
Boucher	Ellison	Jindal
Boustany	Ellsworth	Johnson (GA)
Boyd (FL)	Emanuel	Johnson (IL)
Boyd (KS)	Emerson	Johnson, E. B.
Brady (PA)	Engel	Johnson, Sam
Brady (TX)	English (PA)	Jones (NC)
Brayley (IA)	Eshoo	Jones (OH)
Brown (SC)	Etheridge	Jordan
Brown, Corrine	Everett	Kagen
Brown-Waite,	Fallin	Kanjorski
Ginny	Farr	Kaptur
Buchanan	Fattah	Keller
Burgess	Feeney	Kennedy
Burton (IN)	Ferguson	Kildee
Butterfield	Filner	Kilpatrick
Buyer	Flake	Kind
Calvert	Forbes	King (IA)
Camp (MI)	Fortenberry	King (NY)
Campbell (CA)	Fossella	Kingston
Cannon	Fox	Kirk
Cantor	Frank (MA)	Klein (FL)
Capito	Frank (AZ)	Kline (MN)
Capps	Franks (AZ)	Knollenberg
Capuano	Frelinghuysen	Kucinich
Cardoza	Gallely	Kuhl (NY)
Carnahan	Garrett (NJ)	LaHood
Carney	Gerlach	Lamborn
Carson	Giffords	Lampson
Carter	Gilchrest	Langevin
Castle	Gillibrand	Lantos
Castor	Gillmor	Larsen (WA)
Chabot	Gingrey	Larsen (CT)
Chandler	Gohmert	Latham
Clarke	Gonzalez	LaTourette
Clay	Goode	Lee
Cleaver	Goodlatte	Levin
	Gordon	Lewis (CA)
	Granger	Lewis (GA)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which

the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken tomorrow.

# RECOGNIZING AND HONORING THE LIFETIME CONTRIBUTIONS OF RAFAEL JOSÉ DIAZ-BALART

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 131) recognizing and honoring the lifetime contributions of Rafael José Díaz-Balart on the dedication of the Rafael Díaz-Balart Hall at the Florida International University College of Law.

The Clerk read as follows:

## H. RES. 131

Whereas a native of Santiago de Cuba, Rafael José Díaz-Balart completed his studies at the University of Havana with a law degree in 1919;

Whereas soon after joining the Bar, he became a municipal judge in the city of Palma Soriano, where he served with distinction for four years until, by civil service examination, he obtained the post of civil law notary in the town of Banes in eastern Cuba;

Whereas, while maintaining his law practice, Rafael José Díaz-Balart was elected City Council President and Mayor of Banes;

Whereas he was later elected Congressman and transferred his law practice to the city of Holguín and subsequently to Havana, where he founded the law firm of Díaz-Balart, Díaz-Balart and Amador, with his son, Rafael Lincoln, and Rolando Amador;

Whereas, years later, also by examination, Rafael José Díaz-Balart assumed the post of Land Registrar, a prominent achievement for lawyers in many civil law countries, including Cuba;

Whereas Rafael José Díaz-Balart lived in exile after 1959, and became a proud citizen of the United States;

Whereas along with his son, Rafael Lincoln Díaz-Balart, Rafael José Díaz-Balart commenced law school at the University of Madrid, Spain, and in 1965, at age 66, earned a second Law Degree;

Whereas Rafael José Díaz-Balart died in Miami, Florida in 1985;

Whereas Rafael José Díaz-Balart instilled not only in his son, but in his four grandsons a sense honor and service, which led them to become prominent members of American society;

Whereas his son, Rafael Lincoln, was a prominent member of the Cuban House of Representatives, and his grandsons, Lincoln Díaz-Balart and Mario Díaz-Balart were elected to the United States House of Representatives in 1992 and 2002, respectively, Jose Diaz Balart became a prominent journalist as the Washington bureau chief for Telemundo Network and was the first United States journalist to host daily Spanish and English language newscasts, and Rafael Diaz Balart became a prominent Miami investment banker;

Whereas, on February 10, 2007, Florida International University will dedicate the Rafael Diaz-Balart Hall as the new home of the College of Law;

Whereas Rafael Diaz-Balart Hall will provide a state-of-the-art facility for teaching, research, and study, as well as scholarly and social interaction; and

Whereas the Rafael Diaz-Balart Hall was designed by the internationally renowned architect Robert A. M. Stern, Dean of the School of Architecture at Yale University: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives honors the lifetime accomplishments

and legacy of Rafael José Díaz-Balart for his numerous contributions to democracy, and recognizes the Florida International University dedication of the Rafael Díaz-Balart Hall at the College of Law as an appropriate tribute in his memory.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may insert material relevant to H. Res. 131 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield the time to Representative MEEK from Florida for the purpose of managing the Democratic side of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to come before the House today in support of Resolution 131, to recognize Rafael José Díaz-Balart, grandfather of two of our great colleagues here in this great House, LINCOLN and MARIO DIAZ-BALART.

Rafael Diaz-Balart was a native of Santiago de Cuba and completed his law degree at the University of Havana in 1919. Soon after he joined the bar, Rafael Diaz-Balart became the municipal judge in the city of Palma Soriano, where he served with great distinction. Four years later, he earned a post of civil law notary in the town of Banes in eastern Cuba, where he was later then elected city council president and mayor of the city.

Upon his election to the Cuban House of Representatives, he founded the law firm of Diaz-Balart, Diaz-Balart and Amador in Havana, with his son, Rafael Lincoln, MARIO and LINCOLN's father, and Rolando Amador. Years later, he earned the post Land Registrar, a prominent achievement for lawyers in Cuba.

After the 1959 coup, Rafael Diaz-Balart lived in exile and became a proud citizen of the United States. In exile, Rafael José Díaz-Balart entered law school at the University of Madrid, and in 1965, at age 66, earned his second law degree.

While Rafael Diaz-Balart had many great accomplishments, his greatest of all may have been the honor and sense of duty that he instilled his son Rafael Lincoln and his four grandsons: LINCOLN and MARIO, whom I proudly serve with here in the House; also José, who is a prominent journalist; and Rafael, a successful businessman in Miami.

This week Florida International University Law School will be dedicated in the name of Rafael Diaz-Balart Hall, a tribute to their grandfather. The keynote address will be given by Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader-Ginsburg, and there will be countless Federal, State and local municipal elected officials.

This honor to the Diaz-Balart family is a testimony to the American Dream. Here is a family in a bloodline that left Cuban exile, but came to the United States to make this country better.

The entire family has contributed not only to the south Florida community, but the entire State of Florida, and also this great country of ours, which is the United States of America.

I think the House is full within its right to be able to recognize this great American for what he was able to do in his contributions to those that not only serve here in the House of Representatives, but serve in the fields of journalism and in business. I am honored to bring this to the floor at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KELLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 131, a resolution recognizing and honoring the lifetime contributions of Rafael José Díaz-Balart, on the dedication of the Rafael Díaz-Balart Hall at the Florida International University College of Law.

I would like to thank my friend Mr. MEEK for introducing this important resolution.

The founding of the Florida International University College of Law did not become possible until 2000. The college of law received full accreditation from the American Bar Association in December 2006.

The law school is home to 382 law students and 25 faculty members. The Rafael Diaz-Balart Hall was designed by the renowned architect and dean of architecture at Yale University, Robert A.M. Stern. It incorporates two interior courtyards, an atrium, a reading room, an auditorium, a legal clinic, and two teaching courtrooms. In addition, the hall will have two additional rooms solely for expanding international and foreign law collections.

Of particular interest to the students and the school are volumes focusing on international organization and Caribbean and Latin American law.

□ 1445

Rafael Diaz-Balart, for whom the hall was named, was born in Cuba and earned a law degree from the University of Havana in 1919. He later served as a lawyer, a judge, president of the city council and was eventually elected mayor of the city of Banes and then was elected congressman. Diaz-Balart went into exile in 1959 and earned his second law degree from the University of Madrid in 1965. He died in Miami in

1985. Mr. Diaz-Balart is also the grandfather of two distinguished Members of Congress, MARIO and LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART.

I congratulate the Florida International University College of Law on receiving its full American Bar Association accreditation and the inauguration of this beautiful new hall.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to one of my great colleagues from the Florida delegation (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank both of my good friends from Florida, Mr. KELLER and Mr. MEEK. It is my privilege to join with my colleagues in honoring the life and legacy of the Diaz-Balart family, and particularly Rafael Diaz-Balart, who distinguished himself not just in the Cuban House of Representatives, but by becoming a wonderful citizen of the United States of America and contributing his subsequent generations of his family to the history of the State of Florida and to the United States by lending his two grandsons to the United States House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, across this country we have a wonderful history of naming institutions like law centers after our giants, and Florida is no exception. The Shepard Broad Law Center at Nova Southeastern University is named after a Florida giant. The University of Florida Law Center, the Holland Building, is named after a Florida giant. And now the law center at Florida International University will be named after a Cuban-American, a Florida giant, Rafael Diaz-Balart, and it is my privilege to join my colleagues in honoring his legacy and his life today.

Mr. KELLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and the first Hispanic woman elected in the history of the United States Congress.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank my good friend Mr. MEEK of Florida for presenting this resolution for us today.

I rise in strong support of this resolution, which honors the life of Rafael José Diaz-Balart, a prominent attorney, an elected official in pre-Castro Cuba, who is also the grandfather, as we have heard, of our esteemed South Florida Congressional colleagues, LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART and MARIO DIAZ-BALART, as well as their two other brothers, José Diaz-Balart, a very well known television personality and news anchor, and Rafael Diaz-Balart, a prominent South Florida businessman.

Their grandfather, Rafael José Diaz-Balart, was a native of Santiago de Cuba, and completed his studies at the University of Havana with a law degree

in 1919. While maintaining his law practice, he was also elected city council president and mayor of Banes, and later as a member of the Cuban House of Representatives, similar to our body.

Following the 1959 communist takeover by Fidel Castro, Rafael José Diaz-Balart fled to the United States to live in exile with his family. Shortly following, he proudly became a citizen of the United States. Along with his son, Rafael Lincoln, he commenced law school at the University of Madrid, Spain, and in 1965, at the age of 66, earned a second law degree. He sadly passed away in Miami, Florida, in 1985.

He, like my father Enrique Ros and so many others who fled Cuba due to Castro's tyrannical regime in the last 50 years, Rafael dreamt of a free Cuba, a country where human rights are respected, where political prisoners are freed, with a democratic, multi-party political system that flourishes and a free market economy that thrives, thus allowing the Cuban people and their foreign economic partners to own their businesses and to prosper. None of those things are allowed today.

I am so glad that this Saturday, February 10, the Florida International University College of Law will dedicate its new law center as the Rafael Diaz-Balart Hall. We are also proud of the many accomplishments of FIU, Florida International University, my alma mater, and we think this is a positive step forward.

So I ask my colleagues to join us in commemorating the life of a great patriot, Rafael José Diaz-Balart, a tremendous mentor, a loving husband, a father and one of the most outstanding members of the South Florida community, a freedom fighter from his first to his last breath.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on House Resolution 131.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Mr. KELLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the grandson of Rafael Diaz-Balart, my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida, Mr. KELLER. I want to thank all of those colleagues who have spoken here today. On behalf of my brother, Congressman LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART, who is actually now in a committee and cannot be here, I want to particularly thank Congressman KENDRICK MEEK for this profound and deep honor.

Congressman MEEK, I have to tell you, there are not a lot of secrets in this process, but somehow you kept this a secret, and I am not quite sure how you were able to do this, because both my brother and I didn't know about this until very, very recently. That is something that is frankly unusual, for anything to be kept a secret in this process.

I particularly want to thank the sponsor of this resolution for, again, this honor to our grandfather and our family, our entire family, that this House is giving all of us today.

But when I think of families who have public service in their background, our dear friend Congressman KENDRICK MEEK comes from a family of deep service to our country. As I said recently in a public meeting in Miami, the matriarch of the Florida congressional delegation and particularly the South Florida Members congressional delegation is Congresswoman Carrie Meek, who was not only a fine Member of this institution and also was a member of the Florida legislature for many years, but she is an icon in the history of our Nation. She is one of those who has broken through, her entire life, that glass ceiling, not once, not twice, but many, many times. Then, of course, her son, KENDRICK, who is a tough fighter for issues that he believes in and for the people he represents and who I am honored to call a dear friend of mine.

So I am deeply honored, Congressman. I am deeply honored for all of this. On behalf of the Diaz-Balart family, I just want to thank you for this deep honor, this deep privilege. It is a day that we will not soon forget. Again, just thank you all very much.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting when you look at this resolution, because it is the American Dream. Some Americans don't have the opportunity to have a resolution brought before the House of Representatives honoring the memory of their bloodline, their father and their grandfather and their entire family. But I can tell you that, in the words of my grandmother, saying "isn't God good," this resolution displays the American Dream.

As we start to look at this resolution, as we start to reflect on the contributions of the Diaz-Balart family to the United States of America, to find that it not only didn't start totally with Rafael José Diaz-Balart, but he had a lot to do with the pilgrimage to the United States of America and the contributions that his grandchildren have made and that his son made in this society, that have made America better. It has brought us together in many ways.

Understanding a story of some of the issues facing America right now, as some folks may feel about recent immigrants to this country, this is a perfect example to set up on the pedestal of how those that come to our country with the will and desire to serve this country, not to pull from this country, but to serve on behalf of this country, what can happen.

We have four individuals that are the grandchildren of the very man that we are recognizing here in the House of Representatives, this great country of ours, individuals fought to allow us to

salute one flag. Two are contributing to this country, serving at the same time in the U.S. House of Representatives in this Congress and in the last Congress and the Congress before that, and one is at the top of journalism as it relates to Spanish language international television, and another is a prominent businessman in South Florida. I think this is a time that the House is rightfully recognizing these great Americans for what they were able to do.

Mr. Speaker, to Mr. DIAZ-BALART and to Mr. KELLER and to all of my colleagues here, it is a great honor to bring this before the House, because I believe everyone can understand the reason why we are here, and it is justified. But this could be one of many examples of families that have contributed to our country. I know they will continue to do so, and I know their children's children will continue to do so, and this moment in history will just be one beacon of light to show how appreciative we are for not only the Diaz-Balart family for their contributions but other families like them.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KELLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would totally agree with my colleague, Mr. MEEK, that the Diaz-Balart family has made America a much better place for all of our children to grow up. I have been very honored to serve with both LINCOLN and MARIO DIAZ-BALART, and I know they both have a lot of pride in their grandfather.

I am very happy that Mr. MEEK introduced this resolution honoring Rafael Diaz-Balart. Mr. MEEK also obviously has a lot of pride in the bloodline he has with the famous Congresswoman Carrie Meek. I was reminded of her just this past weekend when I was down in Miami for the football game on Sunday and I parked on Carrie Meek Boulevard down there.

I explained to the parking lot attendant that I served with Carrie Meek and I am friends with her son, KENDRICK MEEK. He said, Yeah, man. That will be thirty bucks. It only gets you so far. But I have a lot of pride in knowing both of these families.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance my time.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I just would like to thank Mr. MILLER of the Education Committee, also the majority leader's office and the Speaker's office for allowing us to bring this resolution so that it can be timely for the dedication this weekend when the good people of Florida and this great country and the Supreme Court Justice will honor the memory of Rafael José Diaz-Balart at the naming of the hall of the law school.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 131.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1500

#### AMERICAN HEART MONTH

(Ms. FALLIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FALLIN. Madam Speaker, as you know, February is American Heart Month. It is a time when we here in Congress and the people across America can reaffirm their commitment to fighting heart disease, the number one killer in Oklahoma and the entire United States.

Nearly 80 million American adults suffer from some form of heart-related illness. Every 35 seconds, an American dies from that illness. Heart disease kills more Americans than the number two, three and four leading causes of death combined.

Madam Speaker, heart disease is a big problem for women just as it is for men, if not more so. In 1984, more women than men died from heart disease. In Oklahoma, 19 women die every day of a heart-related illness.

Last Friday, millions of men and women participated in National Wear Red Day to honor the many women who have been touched by heart disease. This was a great gesture, reminding us of the importance of fighting the disease. And we can fight it by exercising, maintaining health, eating healthy and refraining from smoking.

Madam Speaker, I encourage all my colleagues and all Americans to remember the millions of people affected by heart disease this month and to Wear Red Day for heart disease. By raising awareness of this disease, we can improve the lives of millions of men and women in this country.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SOLIS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, the President and his administration would be wise to avoid making Iran the next Iraq. Despite that, the demonizing

of Iran has begun as the President tries to divert the attention of the American people away from the Iraq debacle. Instead of advocating diplomacy in the region as recommended by the Iraq Study Group and countless leaders in both political parties, the President is making veiled threats that are becoming increasingly worrisome. The boiling caldron of violence in the Middle East is growing hotter, and to many people, the policies and pronouncements of the President concerning Iran are seen as throwing gasoline on the fire.

As the situation worsens in Iraq, the President talks more and more about Iran, as if the attention of the American people and the world can so easily be diverted. That is not going to work this time. The focus of the American people, indeed the focus of the world, is on the U.S. occupation of Iraq and the disastrous war the President continues to wage and escalate. We know he is raising the stakes in Iraq. Many fear Iran is not behind. And we see an irony in that.

Leaders in the Middle East I met with recently in Jordan blame Paul Bremer, the President's first administrator in Iraq, believing Bremer, unwittingly or otherwise, handed Iraq to the regime in Iran. He did it with disastrous decisions.

First, he dismantled the Iraqi army. That left the border between Iraq and Iran unguarded and open to the infiltration of weapons and insurgents to foment violence in Iraq.

Bremer gave the Shi'a effective control by mandating they receive a majority of seats in reconstituting an Iraqi government.

These decisions opened the border and at the same time tightened relationships between Iranian Shi'a and Iraqi Shi'a. It set the stage for Iran's influence to grow stronger and stronger inside Iraq and unleashed a torrent of violence, pitting Iraqi against Iraqi with American soldiers caught in the cross fire. Is there any wonder that many Iraqis believe their nation is being handed over to Iran by the U.S.?

Now, many believe the President's saber rattling toward Iran has less to do with its efforts to develop a nuclear weapon and more to do with his failure to understand the region and contain Iran from the outset of the war. Thoughtful people in the United States and around the world fear the President is compounding the trouble, not confronting the problems in a troubled region. Where does all this saber rattling go? History shows us the way.

In less than one generation, we have done what we vowed never to do again: We have allowed a President to stampede the Nation into a hopeless war, not because we had to but because he wanted to. This President believed he could have victory by saying it was so. We have seen the tragic consequences of that.

There are so many parallels between the Iraq debacle and Vietnam; it is unbelievable. The President and many



people in America forgot the lessons of history when a blank check was given to a President in Iraq. There are still some lessons to learn.

The Vietnam War was going badly, so much so that an earlier President did not merely escalate the war, he expanded it into Laos and Cambodia, secret bombing that did not shorten the Vietnam War or offer a path to resolution.

My fear is that we will forget all the lessons of the Vietnam War. It is time to ask the question: Is Iran the next Laos or Cambodia?

With things going badly in Iraq, will the President continue to ignore the lessons of history and order the American military not merely to escalate but to expand the war beyond Iraq? I wish a question like this did not have to be asked, but we cannot watch Iraq, consider Vietnam, and not worry that a President who refuses to learn from history or admit mistakes is not doomed to repeating the same mistakes.

Military action is not the answer in Iraq, in Iran or Gaza, or any other flash point in the Middle East. We need to dispatch an army all right, an army of diplomats armed not with bullets but with ideas, with resolve and with a book of American history in every briefcase.

The way out of Iraq must begin here on Capitol Hill, because down the street at the White House, they are only talking about more ways in and, we fear, other places to go. This war must end now, and there should be a binding resolution to indicate that to the President and to the American people.

#### AMNESTY FOR U.S. BORDER PATROL AGENTS RAMOS AND COMPEAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, 3 weeks ago, two U.S. Border Patrol agents entered Federal prison. Agents Ramos and Compean never should have been sent to prison.

These agents were convicted last spring for shooting a Mexican drug smuggler who brought 743 pounds of marijuana across our southern borders into Texas. Members of Congress and countless American citizens have repeatedly petitioned President Bush to pardon these agents. At the House Democratic Caucus last week, the President said, and I quote the President, "We want our Border Patrol agents guarding the borders from criminals and drug dealers and terrorists."

Agents Ramos and Compean were protecting the American people from an illegal drug dealer. Mr. President, we are calling on you today, as you pledged you would last month, to take a sober look at this case.

Many Members of Congress have warned that if these two border agents enter prison, their safety would be threatened by those who hate law enforcement officers. Madam Speaker, tragically this happened last Saturday evening to Agent Ramos who was beaten in prison by a group of Mexican nationals.

Mr. President, the safety of these men is in jeopardy and time is running out. You alone have the authority to correct this injustice by pardoning these two men. Mr. President, please do not delay your review of the facts of this case.

Madam Speaker, my colleagues and I will soon be sending a fifth letter to the President concerning these agents. We are asking the President to please expedite his consideration of a pardon for these two men and help these families realize that America is a country that believes in justice. Madam Speaker, I want to repeat that phrase very quickly: America is a country that believes in justice.

Mr. President, please help these two Border agents. They deserve our praise, not to be in prison. Please, Mr. President, help them out now.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, finally, I have some grounds for agreement with the President, at least rhetorically. He says he is committed to balancing the budget by 2012. Unfortunately, after that statement, our disagreements begin.

First and foremost, he forgets or neglects to tell the American people that he achieves this so-called balance by borrowing \$1.2 trillion of Social Security surplus, spending it and replacing it with IOUs.

Remember, just last year, the President was shocked, shocked, when he went to Parkersburg, West Virginia, that the Social Security trust fund consisted of nothing but IOUs.

Now, the Federal Government is pretty good for its debts unless you run up such a mountain of debt and you cut revenues so much with tax cuts for the wealthy that you can't afford to meet those obligations; you can't afford to cash in the bonds or the IOUs to Social Security. And I believe that is his long-term plan, to bankrupt Social Security, Medicare and other New Deal programs that this administration viscerally hates because they don't encourage people to stand on their own. They say it would be a more productive society if we just didn't have all those so-

cial support programs or guarantees of Social Security.

I think they give people an opportunity. They allow people to take chances during their life because they know, if they don't make it in that business or something else they are trying to do, at least they have got a foundation there for their later years. So we should not jeopardize Social Security; the President should not borrow and spend the entire Social Security surplus just before the baby boomers retire.

But even after he does that, the President's budget does not achieve balance. Far from it. The President's budget assumes there will be no cost for the war in Iraq or the war in Afghanistan after 2009. I guess he has a withdrawal plan he has not told us about.

What about the much vaunted war on terror? No money in the future budgets for that. He assumes all that goes away, you know, the incredible amounts of money we are spending there.

He further assumes that if we cut taxes more for the wealthy, that the government will get more revenues. Now, isn't that a beautiful world? If we could just eliminate taxes for the wealthy, I guess we would go back to having surpluses for the Federal Government under the bizarre economic theories followed by these neoconservatives who thus far have been proven to be pretty wrong on a host of things, starting with Iraq and on down to their bizarre theories that, as you reduce revenues, your revenues increase. They don't.

Plain and simple, the wealthiest among us have to start paying their fair share to support this country particularly in a time of crisis. Why shouldn't they sacrifice? Like the young men and women, many of whom are in the National Guard because they needed an income. Yes, they wanted to serve our country, but they also needed the income; many of whom are in the military, yes, because they want to serve our country but also because they hope to get those education benefits and some training to do better when they come out.

But the wealthiest, they are given a total buy. They have been given tax cuts, the first tax cuts in a time of war in the history of the United States of America. But the President doesn't think we should ask anything of the wealthy, and he pretends that if we extend their tax breaks forever, if we eliminate taxes on estates worth over \$5 million, then in fact the government will have more revenues. Unfortunately, it is not true. It will increase the deficit wildly beyond the numbers in his budget.

So he borrows all of the Social Security surplus, robs the trust funds, spends the money, replaces it with IOUs, cuts taxes for the rich people. How else does he pretend to get the balance? By cutting Medicare.

□ 1515

That will help. \$252 billion cut in Medicare, cutting Medicaid health care for poor people, that will get us to balance, would not want to ask the rich people.

The tax cuts for the rich people so far exceed the cuts that he is making in Medicare and Medicaid, we could fully fund those programs and just ask to restore a fraction of the taxes on people who earn over \$300,000 a year and have estates more than \$5 million, but the President does not want to do that.

He goes on through the entire budget slashing. Again, I agree with what he said. Unfortunately, he did not deliver. He said he would increase Pell Grants. His budget does not increase Pell Grants. It does not increase opportunity for young people to go to college. He does not take on the student loan programs where, if we converted from a bank subsidy program to a national direct student loan program, like I got when I went to college, we could give lower interest rates and make money for the taxpayers. No, he would rather give 17 cents of every dollar of every loan to the banks as profits and subsidies and take it out of the pockets of the students.

This is not an opportunity budget, it is not an honest budget, and it will take this country further down the road toward bankruptcy. That will be George Bush's legacy.

#### DOES ANYBODY CARE? HAS ANYBODY NOTICED?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SOLIS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, does anybody care, has anybody noticed, that:

Our policy toward Iran is hostile and provocative, and thus war seems inevitable?

That we have seized Iranians in Iraq, who claim they are diplomats, and now we have announced that any Iranians found in Iraq may be shot?

Has anybody noticed that large numbers of Iranians go back and forth into Iraq for many reasons, including family, religious and medical reasons, and probably for their own security as well?

Iraq Prime Minister Maliki has expressed opposition to the surge of U.S. troops?

That the violence in Iraq has sharply escalated since Saddam Hussein was hanged?

That the American electorate voted for deescalation of the war, and yet the war is being expanded with no new strategic goals?

That Iraqi officials, from the government we installed, have held conciliatory talks with Iranian officials, something we refuse to do?

That our own CIA acknowledges that Iran is not likely to have a nuclear weapon for at least 10 more years?

That Iran has a right to enrich uranium for peaceful purposes under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, yet we claim they do not? By denying this right to Iran, we actually are violating the NPT.

The neoconservative propagandists promote the idea that President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad speaks for the Iranian people and her government, even though he lacks real power, in order to stir up hatred and generate popular support for an attack on Iran?

We completely ignore the leaders of Iran's National Security Council who have made reasonable statements about the United States and are open to direct talks with us?

That our threats and sanctions against Iran compound the problem by unifying the Iranians against us and undermining the moderates who are favorable toward America?

The latest accusations against Iran sound like a replay of the same charges against Iraq 5 years ago?

But not only does Iran not have a nuclear weapon, it has no significant military power; it is a Third World nation that could be wiped off the face of the Earth by the U.S. or by Israel if it ever attempted hostilities toward us?

One thing for sure, the Iranians are not suicidal?

But our policies toward Pakistan, India and North Korea serve as a great incentive for nations to seek a nuclear weapon, and thus gain respect at home and abroad while greatly lessening the odds of being attacked by us?

The promoters of military confrontation, who glibly criticize those who do not support preemptive, aggressive war are themselves the most extreme diplomatic isolationists, refusing any dialogue with our enemies or potential enemies?

There is no definition for victory in Iraq, and our goals are constantly changing, while the supporters of the war refuse to recognize that a war without purpose, by definition, cannot be won?

That it is now argued that after 4 years of killing, we cannot leave Iraq because a worse chaos would ensue?

That the U.S. naval buildup in the Persian Gulf has ominous overtones, none peaceful?

The world is preparing for a significant escalation of hostilities in the region, but are the American people prepared?

Most Americans in the November election asked for something quite different?

Our proxy war to bring about regime change in Somalia and gain control of the Horn of Africa scarcely has been noticed by the American public or the politicians in Washington?

That few observers noticed that we have placed in power some of the same warlords who humiliated us in 1993 in Mogadishu?

That the empty slogan "War on Terror" has no meaning and, therefore, it has no end?

That it serves as an excuse for endless war, anyplace, anytime.

That terrorism is a mere tactic and does not describe the nature of the enemy?

That acts by criminal gangs do not justify remaking the Middle East and Central Asia?

The careless support for this international war on terrorism has permitted the U.S. to intervene militarily and to bring about regime change in three countries: Iraq, Afghanistan, and Somalia. Now we are provoking Iran so we can have an excuse to do the same thing there. But who knows, maybe we will have to deal with a regime change in Pakistan first, a regime change that will not be to our liking.

Let us hope Congress comes to its senses soon and starts to defund our interventionist policies before we go broke. Time is short.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### HONORING NATIONAL BLACK HIV/AIDS AWARENESS DAY 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Madam Speaker, today we mark the seventh year that we commemorate National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day. This is a bittersweet accomplishment. While I am proud to say that awareness of this epidemic's effect on the black community has grown over these 7 years, it pains me to admit that this disease continues to affect African Americans at a disproportionately large and growing rate.

I consider the fight against the HIV/AIDS epidemic to be one of the most pressing issues of our time and of my tenure here as a Member of Congress. This issue attracted my concern years ago when I became aware of the staggering rate at which infants contract HIV from their mothers during birth or breast-feeding.

I helped to raise awareness of this important issue when I came to Congress in 1996 through the introduction of and authorizing a bill and going to the Appropriations Committee to target the mother-to-child transmission. At that time, it was mother-to-child transmission internationally, and President Bush eventually incorporated aspects of my legislation in PEPFAR, the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief.

While mother-to-child transmission continues to be a pressing problem abroad, we have shown some success in

fighting this here in the United States. The rate of perinatal HIV has decreased steadily from 122 in 2000 to 47 in 2004. Of course, the only acceptable rate of mother-to-child transmission is zero. However, we would do well to achieve a similar 60 percent reduction in all categories of HIV infection.

So today we focus on the HIV epidemic among African Americans. The statistics are staggering, and it highlights the growing impact this epidemic has on African Americans.

In 1985, blacks accounted for 25 percent of AIDS diagnosed, whereas in 2005 they accounted for 50 percent of new diagnoses. This statistic is all the more staggering because in 2005 African Americans only made up 12 percent of the population of this country.

In 2005, 75 out of every 100,000 African Americans had AIDS, compared to only 7.5 out of every 100,000 whites.

Perhaps more disturbing, African American women and children suffer at a rate that is even greater than that of African Americans overall.

Black women accounted for 67 percent of new AIDS cases among women in 2005, compared to 16 percent among white women.

In 2005, young African Americans accounted for only 15 percent of U.S. teens, yet they accounted for 75 percent of new AIDS cases.

In 2002, HIV was the number one cause of death for black women between the ages of 25 and 34, and this is why, Madam Speaker, that I started the first-of-its-kind AIDS Walk for minority women and children and dedicated that to minority women and children. We celebrated 10 years last year because of the staggering statistics that we are still faced with, and we will not stop until we eradicate this dreadful disease. It is ravishing the communities of Latinos, especially Latinas, African American women and both our children.

The devastating effects of this epidemic have not escaped the notice of African American communities, in part due to the success of the National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day. Half of the African Americans say the HIV/AIDS is a more urgent problem than it was a few years ago, and indeed, it is. Half of African Americans also believe that the U.S. is losing ground in the fight against this epidemic domestically.

Today is an important day in the effort to increase awareness of the HIV/AIDS epidemic in the African American community. However, awareness is not enough. We must work toward solutions to reduce and eventually eradicate not only the racial disparities of HIV/AIDS, but the disease itself. To do so we must increase funding for domestic HIV/AIDS programs, particularly those that target minorities. We must strengthen our efforts to educate the public, particularly young people. We must work harder to encourage HIV testing, and we must also work to care for those who already have contracted this devastating illness.

## REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 547, ADVANCED FUELS INFRASTRUCTURE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT

Ms. SLAUGHTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-9) on the resolution (H. Res. 133) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 547) to facilitate the development of markets for alternative fuels and Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel fuel through research, development, and demonstration and data collection, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

### NYPD'S FINEST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, the NYPD is one of the most recognizable police departments not only in the United States, but the world.

Nearly 38,000 strong, these brave men and women protect and serve the greater New York metropolitan area and its citizens. Being a peace officer in New York City is a dangerous job. It has always been a dangerous job, and New York peace officers risk their lives daily.

The starting salary for a peace officer in New York City is \$25,000, and once they graduate from the academy, it is only \$32,000, almost poverty wages in one of the most expensive cities in the country to live in.

Yet, each year's recruiting classes, young men and women choose to wear the blue uniform and badge of NYPD. They choose to serve New York City and its citizens with honor and bravery.

Madam Speaker, I have had the opportunity as a former judge in Texas to address NYPD peace officers, and after we got through the language barrier, I found them to be dedicated keepers and protectors of the law.

Officer Patrick Lynch, Christine Schmidt and Joseph Cho are three of the valiant PD police officers from New York City. Little did they know that in the early morning hours of February 5, just a few days ago, they would make and become a cut above the rest of us.

It all started with a guy by the name of Danny Fernandez. He was broke, and he was in debt, so he decided how he was going to get some money to pay his debt and pay off other expenses, and he wanted to commit many serious felony crimes ranging from robbery to attempted murder.

So to begin his crime spree, he needed a weapon to commit these robberies. So he decided to attack an NYPD officer to get a firearm. His choice was 30-year-old Officer Joseph Cho, a 2-month rookie assigned to late-night foot patrol on the tough New York streets.

That night, Officer Cho unknowingly became Fernandez's target. Fernandez attacked him and smashed Cho twice over the head with a baseball bat.

Meanwhile, Officer Patrick Lynch, another rookie, who was also out of the academy just 2 months and assigned to the latenight foot patrol, was on patrol. Around 1:00 a.m., Officer Lynch came face-to-face with the menacing Fernandez, armed with a baseball bat, standing over Officer Cho ready to strike him a third time, even though Officer Cho was on the ground.

So seeing Officer Cho on the ground, unconscious, with the bat-wielding outlaw standing over him, Officer Lynch charged after the suspect, and then he radioed for backup. Responding to his calls for assistance was Officer Christine Smith, a 26-year-old, yes, that is right, rookie within NYPD.

She, like Officers Cho and Lynch, had only been out of the academy for 2 months, and she was on foot patrol just a few blocks away. She had given up a career in teaching to become a peace officer.

Together, this dynamic duo quickly caught the outlaw and held him and charged him with serious crimes.

Their bravery and heroism has earned these three rookies commendations from NYPD Police Commissioner Raymond Kelly. It has also earned them the respect of their fellow officers and the gratitude of the entire city.

Officer Cho received numerous skull fractures and required 20 stitches, but eventually he will recover. The criminal will be facing a jury in New York City for his crimes against New York City's finest, the NYPD.

Lawmen and women like Officers Lynch, Smith and Cho are a rare breed, but they are the Americans who wear the badge to protect and to serve. So, today, we thank rookies Lynch, Schmid and Cho and the thousands other peace officers in this country for their daily valor, courage and sense of duty to the people. These individuals fight the local thugs, child molesters, robbers, killers and street terrorists. They do our work for us. They are what stands between us, the law and the lawless, and we thank them for that.

And that's just the way it is.

□ 1530

### THE SURGE AND IRAQI FORCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SOLIS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, you will recall that the hallmark of the

President's so-called surge, the escalation of troops into Iraq, was that Iraqi forces would actually be on the front lines, while American troops would be providing support.

In fact, a White House fact sheet from the day the President announced escalation, says that the primary element of the strategy is to let the Iraqis lead.

Well, the escalation has begun, and not only are they not leading, we are lucky if they even show up. That is right. Reportedly, as many as 50 percent of the Iraqi troops expected and needed for the Baghdad operation aren't reporting to duty. This doesn't bode well, Madam Speaker. American troops will now bear the brunt of what promises to be deadly, violent, urban warfare.

We are now finding out that the escalation will be twice as large as the President has said, requiring 48,000 additional troops, as opposed to 21,000, as originally announced by the President. Now, if Iraqis aren't prepared for the fight, it is easy to imagine still more U.S. soldiers being sent into the grinder. The surge has barely begun, and already, it is failing.

It is clear, furthermore, that the Maliki government is powerless to live up to its promises. Maliki himself owes much of his political authority to one of Iraq's most powerful militia leaders. So how, exactly, is he going to keep Iraqi communities safe from the militias?

On their way out the door, General Abizaid and General Casey warned that increasing force levels just absolves Iraqis of the responsibility for their own security, and they were absolutely right.

In the State of the Union address, the President said, and I quote him, "... it's time for [the Iraqi] government to act. They have promised to deploy more of their own troops to secure Baghdad . . . They pledged that they will confront violent radicals of any faction . . . and they need to follow through."

If they don't, where is the "or else" in the President's words, and where are the consequences if they don't meet these benchmarks and honor these commitments?

Madam Speaker, it is time for fewer carrots and more sticks. Edward Luttwak of the Center for Strategic and International Studies put it succinctly. He said, "it's time for the Iraqis to make their own history." Or, in the words of Luttwak's New York Times op-ed piece yesterday, he said, "To Help Iraq, Let It Fend for Itself."

There is only one solution, a quick military withdrawal from Iraq. I have a bill that was sponsored by 33 other Members of Congress that will do precisely that. H.R. 508, the Bring Our Troops Home and Iraq Sovereignty Restoration Act will do exactly what we need. It will take our troops out of harm's way and force Iraqis to secure their own country. We won't leave

them high and dry. The bill calls for an international stabilization force, but one that would come only at the request of the Iraqi government for no more than 2 years, and with other nations taking on the burden as well.

H.R. 508 will have our troops home in 6 months, leaving behind no permanent military bases and turning over control of the Iraqi oil to the Iraqi people. We will not abandon Iraq. We will continue to be a partner in the reconciliation and reconstruction, but it is time for us to end the military occupation that has failed so tragically. There are no good answers here, but one thing is for sure: There is nothing more our soldiers can do to bring peace to the streets of Baghdad or any other part of Iraq. If anything, our continued presence is aggravating an already combustible situation, which, in fact, we created. We created this situation with our invasion in the first place. Madam Speaker, it is time for Iraqis to defend Iraq, and it is time for American troops to come home.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DREIER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### HONORING TAYLOR SIAS AND KEVIN TEMPLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to talk about two outstanding youths in my district and to highlight, I think, something that we do too rarely here and across America. We talk a lot about our young people in their teens playing video games, not getting involved in their communities, not trying new sports, not enjoying the outdoors.

Today I am very privileged to talk about two such individuals in my district who are breaking the mold and are, I think, achieving at high levels, but they are also doing it by enjoying the great outdoors and also bringing strength to their communities.

First, I would like to recognize Taylor Sias from Weston, West Virginia, for representing our State in the 2007 Bassmaster CastingKids National Semi-Finals Competition in Gadsden, Alabama.

Taylor is a sixth grade student at Robert L. Bland Middle School in Weston and is a three-time State champion. Taylor previously competed in the 2004 semifinals in Tulsa, Oklahoma, and in the 2005 semifinals in Orlando, Florida. The Bassmaster CastingKids challenge is to flip, pitch and cast a hookless lure into a bull's eye target. Sounds kind of hard to me.

BASS developed the Bassmaster CastingKids program in 1991, open to

young people in two age groups, 7-10 and 11-14. The goals of this competition are to involve America's youth in fishing and to foster in each participant an appreciation and a concern for our outdoors. Participants compete in local events conducted by affiliated BASS federation national clubs. Local event winners proceed to their State finals where each State then determines two to represent their State at the national semifinals. From the national semifinals, only 10 contenders advance on to the national championship. Since its inception, over 1.5 million youth have participated in the program, and over \$2 million in cash prizes and scholarships have been awarded.

I would again like to congratulate Taylor and thank him for proudly representing West Virginia at the 2007 Bassmaster CastingKids National Semifinals Championship and wish him the best of luck in becoming an accomplished angler.

Madam Speaker, the other youth I would like to talk about today is Kevin Templan of Charlestown, West Virginia. Kevin became the first member of Boy Scout Troop 82 to achieve the rank of Eagle Scout. His commitment to family and community and church played an integral part in this achievement. Kevin worked on a beautification project at Saint Peter's Catholic Cemetery for his Eagle Scout project.

He is recognized by the Boy Scout National Honor Society, Order of the Arrows, for adhering to the traditions and values of scouting. A senior at Jefferson County High School, Kevin is a drummer in the Cougar Marching Band. He attends Saint James Greater Catholic Church where he will soon be a member of the Knights of Columbus. Kevin enjoys reading, origami and spending time with his younger brother and sister.

The Templan family recently moved to my district from Bryan, Texas, and we welcome them. I would like to take this opportunity to extend a warm West Virginia welcome to Kevin and his family. Jefferson County is fortunate to host such an accomplished young leader. It is a pleasure to serve such devoted young citizens like Kevin in West Virginia's Second District.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ELLISON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KAGEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. KAGEN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### BLACK AIDS AWARENESS DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, today is Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day, a day when we urge African Americans to get educated, get involved and get tested. On Monday, the House passed my resolution H. Con. Res. 35, recognizing the goals and the ideals of Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day.

The global HIV/AIDS pandemic is simply devastating black America, Africa and the Caribbean in disproportionate numbers to the rest of the world. With 40 million people infected around the world, over 1 million of which are right here in the United States, this disease is as much a problem in South Africa as it is in my district in Alameda County.

In the United States, among young people, among women, and among men, African Americans are at the most risk of getting infected with HIV, of developing AIDS and of dying of this disease. The unfortunate reality is that to be black in America is to be at greater risk of HIV and AIDS.

The numbers are staggering, but let me just mention a few specifically. According to CDC, in 2005, African American women accounted for 66 percent of all new HIV/AIDS cases among women. Compared to white women, African American women were 25 times more likely to be infected. Today, AIDS is the number one, number one cause of death among African American women between the ages of 25 and 34. That is, quite frankly, just mind boggling.

Black gay men are also heavily affected by this disease. In 2005, CDC surveyed black gay men in five United States cities and found that 46 percent, 46 percent were HIV positive. The situation is just as stark in my own district. In Alameda County, over 6,600 cases of AIDS have been diagnosed since 1980, and nearly 4,000 people have died. Of those numbers, African Americans represent well over 40 percent of the cumulative AIDS cases and AIDS deaths in the county.

In 1998, we became the first county in the nation to declare a state of emergency in the African American community. We tapped into the emergency funds and started a community-wide task force that included local AIDS service organizations, elected officials and county health departments. Together, this task force sought to provide a focused and very targeted response to the AIDS epidemic within the African American community in Alameda County.

At the same time, here in Congress, with the leadership of my colleague, Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS, who

was then chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, and Congresswoman DONNA CHRISTENSEN, and, of course, with President Clinton signing this, we created the Minority AIDS Initiative in 1998. I have to thank the gentlelady from California for her leadership in helping us break the silence here on Capitol Hill with regard to the devastating cases and the situation of African Americans in America as it relates to HIV and AIDS, and recognizing the inability of our traditional programs to serve the minority communities.

The Minority AIDS Initiative was specifically designed to build capacity and to expand HIV/AIDS outreach activities so that we can target programs and services, target them directly to those who need them. It took us 8 years, but I am happy to say that, last year, we finally codified the Minority AIDS Initiative by passing the Ryan White Treatment Modernization Act at the end of the Congress last year, which included the Minority AIDS Initiative.

□ 1545

But now, of course, what do we have to do? We have got to fully fund it. We need a minimum of \$61 million, and that is just a drop in the bucket. We need billions of dollars to address this pandemic. And at the same time we have got to go further. We have got to get to the real factors that are ultimately driving the epidemic in the African American community: poverty and discrimination, the lack of affordable housing, the disproportionate rates of incarceration among black men, poor access to care, and limited cultural competency for health service providers.

All of these deserve our attention and deserve action. We can start to get at one of these factors by ending really what this is, is a head-in-the-sand approach to HIV prevention that is turning our prisons, really turning our prisons into a breeding ground for this disease.

We need to provide routine, but rigorous opt-out HIV testing that is linked with treatment for all incarcerated persons. Congresswoman WATERS, I am sure she will talk about her bill in her presentation. But this is, again, a major step in the right direction. We have got to pass Congresswoman WATERS' bill, my bill, H.R. 178, which is called the Justice Act. This would allow condoms in our prisons and demand accountability in stopping the spread of HIV and other sexually transmitted infections among incarcerated persons.

We have got to do this. This is a crisis. And we have to do this part, our part, in Congress to make sure that this happens. We must continue to work with advocates and health providers and faith communities to raise awareness, to get tested and to get active in our communities.

We participated last year with the International Aids Conference in To-

ronto, and there were wonderful, unbelievable activists at that conference from America, African Americans, who came to Toronto to raise the plight of the African American AIDS pandemic to the international level.

Many were amazed that here in America we have a pandemic that is just killing many of our communities. At that conference many of our civil rights organizations recommitted themselves to making the stamping out of HIV and AIDS a top priority in terms of their overall objectives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SOLIS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. TIAHRT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### LIFT THE RESTRICTION ON MEMBER TRAVEL ON PERSONAL AIRCRAFT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PEARCE. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the group today. I represent the southern district of New Mexico, New Mexico 2. I come with a chart today, and with a map of the district.

Now, if you can visualize, I live all the way on the east side of the State, Hobbs, New Mexico. We are about 3 miles from the Texas border and represent all of the way to Arizona. Now, it is almost a 9- to 9½-hour drive to come across to the Silver City area, and then if we have to go further north up into the Zuni area, it takes an additional 2 to 3 hours.

So each time I go home is a lot of miles. On a 3-day weekend, we have made up to 1,000 miles. On the 10-day breaks, we have been known to make up to 2,500 miles with events all of the way across. And then on our first 30-day break, our August break in my first year here, we had 29 different motel rooms and about 6,500 miles that we made to cover this large district.

Now, my particular approach today is to talk about a rule that the new majority put into place when we voted on January 4, 2007. I will read from those rules, House Resolution 6, section 207, rule 23, item 15(a). A Member, Delegate or Resident Commissioner may not use personal funds, official funds or campaign funds for a flight on a nongovernment airplane that is not licensed by the FAA to operate for commission or hire.

Now, in the FAA there are basically two categories of operating for hire. There is the category of airlines. Those operate under section 121 of the FAA rules. The second section that is predominately used is section 135; that is, the charters. Those are the private aircraft that are used that you call, and

they are like a taxi. They show up so they are called air taxis or air charters.

Now, these are the only two categories who live in the West, in these broad, sprawling districts. We all represent about 6- to 800,000 people. That is determined by our districting process. So everybody represents the same number of people, but it requires a lot more ground for me to represent 600,000 people, so I have a small aircraft, a four-place aircraft, single engine, that I use to fly around the district.

Now, when it takes me 9 hours to drive across this district, I can make it in about 2½ in that small aircraft. That is about the size of a Volkswagen. If I get in, the ceiling is just barely above my head. My knees are touching. And if people get in the rear seats, their knees are absolutely up against us. So this is not like some limousine service.

This is just basically a small aircraft with a 210 horsepower engine, very economical. I would use the same gallons of gas to fly across the district as I would to drive across it. But according to the rules that are adopted by the new majority, we cannot any longer use this. I cannot even pay for this out of my own pocket to serve the constituents of New Mexico. It is against the rules. I will be held in violation of House rules. And why they did it, I do not know. It affects as many people in their party as it does ours.

Now, given that backdrop, it is very interesting to see that the Speaker of the House now wants a 42-place aircraft to transport her. She was given the access to a Lear jet-type aircraft that the former Speaker used, 12 seats, 5 crew members, and those are very comfortable, plush seats. But now then she is wanting a 42-person aircraft with a crew of 16.

The cost of flying that aircraft is \$22,000 per hour. The cost for her to round-trip back and forth to California is going to be an astounding \$420,000. Now, we just voted for an omnibus where we took funds away from our military, and yet she is asking the military to not only take funds away from the troops, but also to fund this \$420,000 trip, presumably every weekend, because all of us try to go home every weekend.

At the same time she has taken a constitutional provision for me to use my private property, to use my own funds, my own aircraft, and I cannot do that because she has made it against the rules.

Now, we were told when the Democratic majority took over that there was going to be a new way of doing business, and we are finding out what that way of doing business is today. We are finding the willingness to limit people from using personal assets, while on the other hand reaching for these extraordinarily large perks.

Madam Speaker, I would request unanimous consent to submit for the RECORD the actual words of the rule.

Also I would like to submit for the RECORD the Washington Post article which brings out the observations about this new Speaker requesting these. It is dated February 6, 2007. And then I would like to submit for the RECORD the Lou Dobbs comments last night that she could take a circus with her. So we will submit those.

H. RES. 6 RULES RESTRICTIONS ON MEMBERS TRAVEL

**SEC. 207. FURTHER LIMITATION ON THE USE OF FUNDS FOR TRAVEL.**

Rule XXIII is further amended by redesignating clause 15 (as earlier redesignated) as clause 16, and by inserting after clause 14 the following new clause:

15. (a) A Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner may not use personal funds, official funds, or campaign funds for a flight on a nongovernmental airplane that is not licensed by the Federal Aviation Administration to operate for compensation or hire.

“(b) In this clause, the term ‘campaign funds’ includes funds of any political committee under the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, without regard to whether the committee is an authorized committee of the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner involved under such Act.”.

[From CNN, Feb. 5, 2007]

**42 BUSINESS CLASS SEATS, A FULLY-ENCLOSED STATE ROOM, AN ENTERTAINMENT CENTER**

CORRESPONDENT: “It’s clear skies for Nancy Pelosi. The Pentagon is providing the House speaker with an Air Force plane large enough to accommodate her staff, family, supporters and members of the Californian delegation when she travels around the country....

“Pelosi wants routine access to a larger plane. It includes 42 business class seats, a fully-enclosed state room, an entertainment center, a private bed, state-of-the-art communications system and a crew of 16....

“It would be 42 people, and clearly she won’t be the only one on this plane. She wants to have members of the congressional delegation. And her critics will say, look, this is a very nice perk that she can share with her colleagues and use as leverage, should she need to.”

LOU DOBBS: “Well, it’s really a fascinating thing: 42. She could take a circus with her, for crying out loud.”

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 6, 2007]  
**PELOSI CATCHES NONSTOP FLIGHTS HOME**

Amid rumblings from conservatives that she is seeking special treatment, House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D) will receive use of an Air Force jet larger than the one used by her predecessor, Rep. J. Dennis Hastert, so she can fly nonstop to her home in San Francisco.

Ever since the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks, the speaker, who is next in line for the presidency after the vice president, has been given use of a government plane for security reasons. Hastert (R-Ill.), who had flown commercially before the attacks, was the first to have use of a plane. But the one he traveled in was too small to make it to California without refueling.

Yesterday, the House sergeant-at-arms issued a statement saying that the leadership is awaiting word from the Air Force on the rules for using the plane. It is unclear, for example, who can travel with Pelosi and whether she can return home from a political event on taxpayer-funded plane.

Pelosi’s office requested the guidelines, triggering a story in the Washington Times in which sources questioned whether she was

asking for more than the former speaker received.

Democratic aides sputtered about a “right-wing hatchet job” to make Pelosi look bad. But, said one involved in the negotiations, “this is about security, not about convenience.”

An aide in Hastert’s office said yesterday that the former speaker used the plane for official business but not for political travel. He did at times transport his wife and staff when he was flying to and from Illinois.

Brendan Daley, a spokesman for Pelosi, said that she will not use the plane for political travel.

[Feb. 5, 2007]

**SOURCE: STANDARD PLANE NOT BIG ENOUGH FOR . . . SUPPORTERS AND OTHER MEMBERS**

“The Department of Defense offered Speaker Pelosi the same aircraft” as the one used by Hastert, said one senior Republican who has spoken extensively with Defense Department officials about Pelosi’s requests. “She found it was not big enough for staff, supporters and other Members.”.

[From the Examiner, Feb. 5, 2007]

**COLUMNIST: SPEAKER NANCY PELOSI NOW WANTS TO BE CUT IN ON THE TAKE**

“Well, that didn’t take long. After campaigning against the ‘waste, fraud, and abuse’ of the Bush administration, House Speaker Nancy Pelosi now wants to be cut in on the take.

“The woman who five months ago said, ‘Democrats are committed to a new direction in the way our government does business so taxpayers’ money is handled responsibly,’ is dunning the White House to put an Air Force jet at her disposal—reportedly, not only for her use, but for her family’s as well. . . .

“But all of this luxury doesn’t come cheap. Hourly operating costs for an Air Force C-32—the planes that typically carry the vice president, the first lady, and Cabinet officials—are about \$15,000 an hour.

“So for one of those planes to fly the speaker home to San Francisco, drop her off, and fly back and get her, would cost taxpayers around \$300,000—while round-trip commercial fares start at \$233. That doesn’t qualify as “waste and abuse”?

[From the Washington Times, Feb. 5, 2007]

**SOURCE: PELOSI AIDES PRESSING THE POINT OF HER SUCCESSION**

“The sources, who include those in Congress and in the administration, said the Democrat is seeking regular military flights not only for herself and her staff, but also for relatives and for other members of the California delegation. A knowledgeable source called the request ‘carte blanche for an aircraft any time.’

“‘They [Pelosi aides] are pressing the point of her succession and that the [Department of Defense] needs to play ball with the speaker’s needs,’ one source said. . . .

“U.S. Air Force travel for VIPs such as members of Congress is first-rate. The planes are staffed with stewards who serve meals and tend an open bar.”

[From Fox News Channel, Feb. 5, 2007]

**PELOSI SEEKS MILITARY PLANE FOR MERE “152-MILE TRIP” TO DEMOCRAT RETREAT**

“Pelosi’s office also inquired about a military plane for the 152-mile trip to a Democratic party congressional conference in Williamsburg, Virginia last week. No plane was provided.”



## MINORITY AIDS INITIATIVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, the first annual National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day was organized on February 23, 2001, with the message: Get educated, get involved, get tested. The National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day dates back to 1999 when the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's Division of HIV/AIDS Prevention funded five national nonprofit organizations known then as the Community Capacity-Building Coalition, which are Concerned Black Men, Incorporated, of Philadelphia; Health Watch Information and Promotion Services, Jackson State University; Mississippi Urban Research Center; National Black Alcoholism and Addictions Council; and National Black Leadership Commission on AIDS.

On February 23, 2001, the CCBC organized the first annual National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day. The date was changed to February 7, the following year, that was in 2002, and now it is recognized on February 7 of each year.

Madam Speaker and Members, many members of the Congressional Black Caucus and many Members of Congress have joined in the struggle and the fight to find a cure to prevent HIV and AIDS. I need to congratulate all of these Members right in the CBC. I need to congratulate BARBARA LEE, and ED TOWNS, and DONNA CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. CUMMINGS, and ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, and DIANE WATSON, and so many more for the years of work that they have put in on dealing with HIV and AIDS, and HIV and AIDS in the minority community.

That is why back in 1998 I worked to establish the Minority Aids Initiative with the support of the Congressional Black Caucus and the Clinton administration. The Minority Aids Initiative provides grants for HIV/AIDS treatment and prevention programs that serve minority communities and enables health care providers and community-based organizations to expand their capacity to serve these communities.

The initiative received an initial appropriation of \$166 million in fiscal year 1999, and was funded at slightly less than \$400 million in the most recent spending cycle.

However, the AIDS virus has continued to spread in the minority communities, and more needs to be done. This year I am calling for at least \$610 million in funding to expand the Minority Aids Initiative, and redouble our efforts to address the HIV/AIDS epidemic which has been especially devastating to African Americans and other communities of color.

But it is important to remember that HIV/AIDS affects us all. Over 1 million

Americans are living with HIV/AIDS, and 24 to 27 percent of them do not know they are infected. That is why on Monday I introduced H.R. 822, the Routine HIV/AIDS Screening Coverage Act, a bill to require health insurance plans to cover routine HIV/AIDS tests under the same terms and conditions as other routine health screening.

Routine HIV/AIDS screening will allow thousands of African Americans and other infected individuals to find out about their infection, begin life-extending treatment and avoid spreading the virus to others. I also very soon will reintroduce the Stop AIDS in Prison Act, a bill to require routine HIV/AIDS screening of all Federal prison inmates upon entry, and prior to release from prison. The bill would also require HIV awareness education for all inmates and comprehensive treatment for those inmates who test positive.

Madam Speaker and Members, we here today come on the floor of Congress, all of us, to speak about this because it is a pandemic. It is a pandemic in the world that must be dealt with. We must lead the way here in the United States of America.

And for those of us whose communities are being overtaken by HIV and AIDS, we must stand up and be counted. We must ask for the money. We must demand the resources. We must take our heads out of the sand. We must call on all of the members of our community to accept personal responsibility. We must get our churches involved, all of our social clubs and organizations. Today we make a special appeal to them.

---

ON THE PASSING OF LEO T. MCCARTHY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, this week the State of California and indeed the Nation has lost a great leader. Leo McCarthy was a statesman, he was a great champion for justice, and he was a dear friend and purposeful mentor to me. As speaker of the California State House and Lieutenant Governor, Leo McCarthy promoted a values-based agenda to educate our children, grow our economy and protect our environment.

After he left office as the head of the Leo T. McCarthy Center for Public Service and the Common Good at the University of San Francisco, Mr. MCCARTHY taught children and students about promoting justice according to the highest ethical standard. He was brilliant, he was principled and committed to the future.

I am proud to have called Leo a friend for more than 30 years. He encouraged me not only to support can-

didates and be involved in the political process, but he was the main force in encouraging me to run for office in the first place in my own right.

Again, he was my friend and mentor, but he was that to so many people in California. Many who serve in this Congress today were mentored by Leo McCarthy, going back many years.

As recently as Saturday night when I spoke to Leo, he was optimistic about the future. He said, "My morale is high. I am surrounded by my children and my grandchildren," and of course his wife, whom he adored, Jackie. "They are with me, and I am not getting better as quickly as I would like, but I am happy."

My husband, Paul, and I and indeed our entire family, extend our deepest sympathy and condolences to many who loved Leo, especially his wife, Jackie, who he adored, and his children, Sharon, Conna, Adam and Niall.

I also want to recognize our former mayor of San Francisco, Art Agnos, who was a dear friend of Leo and a great comfort to him in his last months. I know Congresswoman ESHOO and I were regular visitors to Leo McCarthy's bed side, and he followed the proceedings of Congress with great interest right up until the last day.

I hope it is a comfort to his family, as I said, whom he adored, that so many people are praying for them at this sad time and that are mourning his loss.

I just wanted to make our colleagues aware of the loss of Leo McCarthy, a great person, a great friend, a great American. He served our country in the military, he served our country in the legislature. He served our country by teaching our young people. He will be sorely missed.

---

□ 1600

## IRAQ STUDY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SOLIS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, before I begin, I would also like to second what the Speaker said with regard to Leo McCarthy. He was also a member of the National Commission on Gambling, which I was the author of. And he came by my office a number of times. And I was actually going to put his bio in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. So I thank the Speaker for that comment, and second it.

Madam Speaker, I was the author of the amendment to set up the Iraq Study Group. I felt that more should be done to look at what we were doing in Iraq, and so we put together a group and picked 10 people. It was chaired by former Secretary of State Jim Baker and former Congressman Lee Hamilton, head of the 9/11 Commission. Also

serving on it was former Secretary of State Larry Eagleberger; former prominent lawyer, Vernon Jordan; former Justice of the Supreme Court Sandra Day O'Connor; former Member of the House and Chief of Staff, in the Clinton administration, Leon Panetta; former Secretary of Defense, in the Clinton administration, Bill Perry; former Senator, and Governor from my State, Chuck Robb; and at one time, up until the end, a month before, current Secretary of Defense Gates, former head of the CIA.

This group was provided the opportunity to, in depth, to take a look at what was going on in Iraq and to develop some recommendations. The resolution that I have introduced as House Con. Res., that puts the Congress on record in support of the recommendations of the Iraq Study Group.

Now, here's a group that has taken 9 months to analyze extensive hearings. Also there were 45 military and diplomatic experts, retired and active duty, of all political persuasions, along with key congressional leaders that came up with these recommendations. So I am asking Members to support my resolution when it comes up next week in support of this.

Secondly, it makes a major effort and encourages the administration to adopt also a diplomatic effort in addition to what it is doing. We urge the administration to engage Syria the same way that President Reagan during the 1980s, when we were defeating communism, President Reagan, God bless him, one of the greatest presidents we have ever had, gave the famous speech in Orlando about the evil empires. But he was also having his administration engage with the Soviet Union. And when Ronald Reagan then gave his speech, saying, "Mr. Gorbachev, tear down that wall," Reagan also had emissaries going to Moscow to engage.

Those of us in the Congress, when we used to go behind the Soviet Union, the Berlin Wall in the Soviet Union, during the 1980s would always meet with the dissidents, would always attempt to meet with the leadership of the government on behalf of freedom, on behalf of liberty.

President Reagan was self-confident in what he believed. He believed that to engage the Soviets was not a sign of weakness. It was a sign of strength.

Madam Speaker, I would like to put in the RECORD an article from the Wall Street Journal by Abraham D. Sofaer, who was counselor to Secretary of State Schultz, who also explains how Reagan engaged with the Soviets and how it is appropriate now how he would engage with Syria.

I am hopeful and I ask all Members to support the resolution when it comes up.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Dec. 20, 2006]

A REAGAN STRATEGY FOR IRAN AND SYRIA

(By Abraham D. Sofaer)

The Iraq Study Group's recommendation that the Bush administration drop its pre-

conditions and negotiate with Syria and Iran has been praised as a "no-brainer"—and condemned as an improper effort to reward rogue regimes. Neither reaction is correct. Negotiating with enemies can be a useful aspect of effective diplomacy. But successful negotiations with enemies result not from the talks themselves but from the diplomatic strategy that accompanies them. The Group's recommendations deserve support, but must be effectively integrated into President Bush's strategy of ending state-sponsored terror.

The arguments against negotiating with Syria and Iran were also made against negotiating with the Soviet Union, and by some of the same people. Soviet misconduct easily matches that of Syria or Iran in aggression, oppression, murder, support for terrorist groups and mendacity. President Reagan challenged Soviet behavior by supporting groups fighting communist intervention, building the military, strengthening NATO, condemning human-rights violations, commencing a missile-defense program, and conveying the message of freedom in every way possible. George Shultz supported these efforts but sought to negotiate with the Soviets in an attempt to increase stability, reduce nuclear weapons, attain freedom for oppressed groups, and enhance understanding. To make negotiations possible the U.S. adopted specific policies, including:

**Regime acceptance.** The U.S. refrained from activities aimed at destroying the Soviet regime it was seeking to influence, while vigorously denouncing its political and moral legitimacy.

**Limited linkage.** Negotiations on human rights, arms control, regional issues and bilateral relations were pursued without linkage to Soviet conduct, enabling negotiations to proceed while the U.S. responded firmly through deeds.

**Rhetorical restraint.** Reagan vigorously criticized the Soviet system and its behavior, but promised not to "crow" when the Soviets agreed to U.S. proposals, enabling Soviet leaders to avoid being seen as capitulating to U.S. demands.

**Self-Interest.** U.S. negotiating policy was based on convincing the Soviets to act in their own best interests.

The Study Group's "external" strategy for Iraq contains several elements necessary for successful diplomacy: the need for both incentives and "disincentives"; negotiations "without preconditions"; and negotiations that are "extensive and substantive," requiring a balancing of interests. The general incentives identified by the Group are unlikely, however, to lead to constructive discussions. While Syria and Iran should realize that preventing a breakdown in Iraq is in their interests, they see great advantages in having the U.S. lose strength and credibility in a costly effort to help a state they are relieved to see powerless. The notion that they will help in order to have "enhanced diplomatic relations" with the U.S. assumes that states, will do what they know the U.S. wants simply because Washington will not otherwise talk to them. The pronouncements that accompany this Bush policy exemplify the sort of rhetoric that discourages cooperation. The possibility of obtaining U.S. assistance in joining the WTO would be a real incentive in an ongoing negotiation, but it is not a credible incentive in the context of hostile confrontation and proliferating sanctions.

The incentives proposed for negotiating with Syria are, by contrast, concrete and substantial. Syria are, by contrast, concrete and substantial. Syria would benefit economically from a stable Iraq, and getting back the Golan Heights would give President Bashar Assad's standing a much needed

boost. Syria has no deep commitment to Hezbollah or Hamas to prevent it from accepting peace and with Israel and increased cooperation in Iraq, Lebanon and the Palestinian areas, in exchange for the Golan and a constructive role in the area. But the Study Group too casually assumes that the U.S. can secure "Syria's full cooperation with all investigations into political assassinations in Lebanon." The "full cooperation" of a sovereign state in such situations must be negotiated, rather than made a precondition. Convincing Israel to give up the Golan Heights will also be difficult, and Syria's help in securing the release of Israeli soldiers seized by Hamas and Hezbollah is a good place to start. While the security threat posed by returning the Golan has largely been worked out in prior negotiations, the challenge posed by Syria's claim to access to the Sea of Galilee, and the meaning of a "full and secure peace agreement" will require great of forts. Still, bringing Syria into a responsible nationhood is an objective well worth pursuing.

The anger and scorn heaped on the Study Group for advocating negotiations with Syria echo the opposition to negotiating with the Soviet Union. But Syrian behavior must be addressed, not just condemned. Egypt, too, wrongfully supported terrorism against Israel after the 1967 war, and launched the 1973 war, to get back the Sinai. Yet, the U.S. properly urged Israel to negotiate with Egypt, and the peace between them serves the interests of both countries. Similarly an agreement to return the Golan in exchange for peace would have the support of most Israelis and the current Israeli government, and would be consistent with governing Security Council resolutions and the principle that precludes acquiring territory by force.

The Study Group is probably right that Iran is unlikely to agree to negotiate with the U.S. to bring stability to Iraq. The distrust between the U.S. and Iran suggests that negotiations between them should commence on limited issues, in a noncontroversial forum. The U.S./Iran Tribunal in The Hague might well work. Iran resents that many of its significant claims against the U.S. remain unresolved there after over 20 years. The U.S. should offer to negotiate these claims on an expedited basis. As progress is made, the dialogue would likely expand to include such issues as Afghanistan, Iraq, commercial matters and human-rights concerns. (During my negotiations with Iran as legal adviser between 1985 and 1990, we resolved many cases and discussed other issues; my interlocutor eventually agreed, for example, that the fatwa against Salman Rushdie could not be enforced in any state outside Iran.) A successful negotiation will include Iranian demands, such as an end to efforts at regime change. Major change in Iran is in fact more likely to result from normalization and internal activities, than by opposition groups seeking to overthrow the regime.

Finally, any effort to negotiate with Syria or Iran will fail if based only on incentives. The Study Group's proposal lacks a program of sufficient pressure to make diplomacy potentially successful. James Baker was able to convene the Madrid Conference in 1991 only after the U.S. had expelled Saddam Hussein from Kuwait. The effort to impose sanctions on Iran for its nuclear program should continue as forcefully as possible. Multilateral sanctions helped get Libya to abandon its quest for nuclear weapons. A clear warning that Syria and Iran must end all forms of state-sponsored terrorism, as now required by Security Council resolutions, must be a central element of U.S. negotiating policy, backed with meaningful preparations for action. The power of the U.S. to inflict damage

on its enemies remains substantial, despite current difficulties in Iraq. While it is now difficult to contemplate military action against Syria or Iran, continued sponsorship of terror against other states will eventually provoke the American people, if not the international community, to exercise their right of self-defense through affordable wars of destruction instead of costly nation-building exercises.

No one can convey this message more effectively than George Bush, who remains determined to prevent a future of state-sponsored terror. He should accept the Study Group's sound message on negotiating with enemies but supplement it with the toughness that effective diplomacy demands.

#### IN OBSERVANCE OF NATIONAL BLACK HIV/AIDS AWARENESS DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, today I rise to observe National Black HIV and AIDS Awareness Day. In doing so, I ask my colleagues and I ask the Nation this question: How many more reports on the HIV/AIDS epidemic in the United States and its disproportionate, detrimental and devastating impact on the African American community must be published before we, as a Congress and as a Nation, acknowledge, observe and uphold the objectives of National Black HIV and AIDS Awareness Day?

African Americans have been and continue to be the hardest hit by this epidemic. Today, HIV/AIDS kills African Americans during the most productive years of life, robbing them of their opportunity to follow their dreams and pursue their destinies and to contribute, not only to their families and their communities but to our society and our Nation. What's more, the numbers are not improving.

African Americans have a HIV diagnosis rate that is more than eight times that of whites. African Americans, who are represented in about 13 percent of the population, account for nearly 50 percent of all new HIV infections, and more than 40 percent of all individuals currently living with AIDS, and 40 percent of all AIDS deaths. The AIDS case rate among African Americans is nearly 10 times, 10 times higher than that among whites.

Particularly affected by HIV and AIDS are African American women. In fact, in 2002, AIDS was the leading cause of death for African American women age 25 to 34 years of age. African American women today are represented in about 7 in 10 new AIDS cases among women and are roughly 25 more times more likely than their white counterparts to be infected with HIV.

Madam Speaker, often as Members of Congress we take to the floor to discuss and debate an issue that resonates with us, not only because of our constituents who are affected but because we personally identify and are dis-

turbed by the issue. And not only as a physician and as chair of the Health Brain Trust of the Congressional Black Caucus but as an African American woman with daughters and granddaughters, this issue is particularly salient. The numbers are particularly disturbing, and our inaction as a country inspires me to stand here today and call on my colleagues to stand up and do more.

I also rise today, Madam Speaker, not only to observe National Black HIV Awareness Day but to encourage my colleagues in Congress on both sides of the aisle to do the same in a manner that is consistent with the day's intent. That intent is to get educated, to get tested and to get involved.

We know that, as members of the Congressional Black Caucus, almost all of whom have been tested, we have a key role to play. I urge all of my colleagues to embrace these objectives today, February 7, and beyond. The HIV epidemic in the United States will not be conquered until we not only encourage but also embrace the destigmatization of the disease among not only African Americans but also all people living and struggling with HIV/AIDS. How one gets infected is irrelevant. HIV affects all people the same way. And we, along with all Americans, should extend a hand of compassion, understanding, fellowship and, most of all, action to help.

Madam Speaker, in this new time with new opportunities, we need to leverage ourselves as Members of Congress to fully fund the Minority AIDS Initiative to at least \$610 million, although we should be asking for more in order to really build the capacity in the minority communities that are hardest hit by the epidemic. That includes the Latino community as well. We should expand voluntary testing, especially among incarcerated, ex-offenders and other high-risk groups, and ensure that all individuals who need it are enrolled in adequate HIV/AIDS related care.

We should also work together to reduce the social determinants of health that put people at greater risk for HIV infection. And we should expand access to culturally appropriate substance abuse prevention programs as well as to drug treatment and recovery services.

Madam Speaker, the budget that was released on Monday clearly deprioritizes the health and health care needs of all people with HIV and AIDS and their families. However, our new political climate has brought us a new day, and we, therefore, must leverage ourselves to redeclare HIV and AIDS as a state of emergency. We must demand that this administration responds to this emergency with adequate funding and resources instead of tax breaks to the wealthy. The lives of far too many people literally depend on it.

And so, today, Madam Speaker, I am proud to stand with my colleagues to

observe National Black HIV and AIDS Awareness Day. I affirm, and we all must stand to affirm that HIV and AIDS in the African American community and communities of color has long been a state of emergency, and from today forward we must respond with compassion and justice. And we, the representatives of the people who are infected and affected, as all of us are, must act.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF RAY BECK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the memory of football all-star and community hero Ray Beck, who passed away recently in Cedartown, Georgia.

Mr. Beck is a football legend both in my home State of Georgia and across the Nation. After 4 years as a star on the Cedartown High School football team, Ray attended Georgia Tech, my alma mater, to play guard for the legendary coach Bobby Dodd.

In 1951, he was named an All-American by the American Football Coaches Association and the Football Writers Association. That same year, he helped lead Georgia Tech to an 11-1 record and an Orange Bowl victory over Baylor University.

After college, Beck was drafted by the New York Giants. He was part of the 1956 World Championship Team. And Madam Speaker, that team included the likes of Y.A. Tittle, Kyle Rote and Sam Huff. They led the Giants to a 56-7 victory over the Chicago Bears, a far more lopsided score than the Indianapolis Colts achieved this past weekend.

On the football field, Ray was known as a team player, someone who gave his all to the game. Because of his tremendous work ethic he was inducted into the Georgia Sports Hall of Fame and the College Football Hall of Fame.

But Ray was more than just a football player. He was an active and enthusiastic supporter of the Cedartown community. The same attitude that made him a star on the field made him a hero in his community. There is hardly an organization in Cedartown that hasn't been touched by Beck's generosity.

Madam Speaker, he was chairman of the Cedartown Development Authority. He was president of the Cedartown Chamber of Commerce, a member of the Polk Medical Center Advisory Board, a board member of the Georgia Motor Trucking Association.

But perhaps he will be best remembered for a charity golf tournament he arranged with his long time friend, Doc Ayers. This annual event raised thousands of dollars for Polk County, for charities such as children's literacy and all the way to local food banks.

It is a little wonder Beck was named Citizen of Excellence by the Cedartown

Civic Arts Commission for his philanthropy to this great community.

One of Ray's former teammates commented that he was, and I quote, "one of the people you could always count on." Ray took that attitude from the football field to the community of Cedartown, and his contributions to both will live on as his legacy. I send my deepest, deepest condolences to his wife, Claire, and to his whole family. I know all of Polk County mourns your loss.

Madam Speaker, as a younger generation looks to sport stars as heroes and role models, I hope they come across men like Ray Beck. He was committed to his team and committed to his community. He gave his all on the field and then gave back to the town where he was raised. He was generous with his time, his wisdom and his energy, and Cedartown, Georgia, is a far, far better place because of him.

Madam Speaker, I ask that you join me in honoring the legacy of Ray Beck.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO CONGRESSIONAL-EXECUTIVE COMMISSION ON THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 22 U.S.C 6913, and the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China:

Mr. LEVIN, Michigan, Chairman.

#### 30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, it is an honor to be here on the floor once again on behalf of the 30-Something Working Group. I am glad to be joined by my good friend, Mr. RYAN, from Niles, Ohio, who has joined me on a number of occasions here. We have joined one another.

□ 1615

We look forward to other members of the 30-Something Working Group joining us here on the floor.

There is a lot going on in the Capitol Building today, a lot of committees meeting, Madam Speaker. A number of bills are moving through the process, and the American people are being served, with a new attitude of the U.S. House of Representatives, especially 110th Congress, that we will work as every American does. We will punch in at the beginning of the week and punch out at the end of the week and work on the weekends sometimes. So that is a good attitude to have, especially when you have two wars going on. You have the President passing on a budget that the American people don't see eye to eye with, nor this Congress sees eye to eye with. But we will work those issues out, and we will talk about them a little further as we move along.

One of the other things that I think that we can touch on are some of the findings, that now these committees are meeting and we have some level of oversight, Madam Speaker, that we are going to find out some things that have been happening in Iraq or what has not been happening in Iraq.

We are also going to learn more about the President's budget as we move along. And I am having a copy of the budget brought to us here on the floor because I want to make sure that the American people and definitely the Members get an opportunity to see this big document. Yesterday and today the Ways and Means Committee held hearings and had the Secretary of the Treasury and now the Office of Management and Budget Director here before the committee today. And there are a lot of questions that are being asked, and very few are being answered. And we will talk about a little of that today.

But once again, I yield to my good friend Mr. RYAN from Niles, Ohio. I am glad that you are here and am looking forward to talking about some of the issues that are facing this Congress and the American people.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. It is an honor to be with you, Mr. MEEK. And I appreciate that you were on the floor today passing legislation commemorating a fine citizen down in Florida, a leader in that community. And I want to thank you for taking the time to come out.

There are so many issues that we need to discuss today, Mr. MEEK. The President submitted his budget this week to the Congress, and we are going to have to go through that with a fine-tooth comb and recognize some of the mistakes that are in there and correct them.

And as I said the other night here, Madam Speaker, the only thing that stands between President Bush's budget, which would have been passed post the election, is Speaker PELOSI. And so we have got a real opportunity here to make things right and to make some real progress.

A couple of things that we want to talk about that are in President Bush's budget that we need to fix immediately as we go through the hearing process is the tax increase that is going to be placed on middle-class families. The President's entire budget is balanced on the backs of 33 million American families who will be forced to pay higher taxes through the alternative minimum tax. This was a tax that was put on years and years ago to make sure that wealthy Americans had to at least pay a base level, the minimum level, of taxes. Regardless of how much you make, you had to pay this much. And through that process over the years, that AMT started creeping and creeping and creeping into middle-class families now to the point where it may go past the \$100,000 point, meaning that if you make \$100,000 or possibly even less, you will be forced to pay this alternative minimum tax. The President did not deal with that. We are going to have to fix that because the alternative is it means a tax increase on 33 million Americans.

Cuts to health care and to our seniors, Madam Speaker. The President's budget cuts Medicare and Medicaid by over \$100 billion over 5 years, \$300 billion over the next 10 years. And these are two key components of our health care system in the United States of America that cover about 80 million Americans. There have also been cuts to home energy assistance for poor families. As cold as it is today here in Washington, D.C., and across the country, the President submits a budget that cuts that by about 18 percent.

There are a couple other things I want to talk about here, Mr. MEEK, and I am glad you are paying attention and asking me to help you out here today. We have seen this tremendous change in the economy over the past couple of decades where we went from basically a national economy to an immediate global superpower post-World War II. And with that there have been tremendous changes.

Here is one of the key components that have affected us, and as capital moves and globalization occurs, whether we like it or not, Mr. MEEK, here is what has happened. This is a chart that indicates the new global workforce. And the increase, from the left side, 1985 to 2000, the increase from about 2 billion people that were considered in the global workforce to almost 6 billion people. That means China has been added to the list. That means India has been added to the list. That means Central American countries have been added to the list. And now all of a sudden we have expanded the global labor supply, which has driven down wages for people here in the United States. This is a major issue that we have to deal with.

And, Mr. MEEK, as you know, Speaker PELOSI was kind enough to appoint me to the Appropriations Committee, and today we had a meeting with our chairman Mr. OBEY, and he said we

want our committee to be about the future, and we want our committee to solve future problems. And that is really what we need to deal with here.

Here is another issue. As we have had the increase in labor, most Americans have been losing ground, Madam Speaker. And if you look at real median household income, and this comes from the New Democratic Network Web page, this is from the U.S. Census Bureau. Real median household income: In 1999, it was \$47,500, real median household income. It was, in 2005, \$46,500. That real median household income is dropping, not rising. And so this is an issue that the President's budget does not address, but we are going to have to address this, and we have already made great strides to do this.

Two other charts I want to share with Mr. MEEK, Madam Speaker, real quickly is people say, well, if you are productive, you will make more. The top line here in the red is the increase in productivity; the blue line is the median income. As productivity has increased by 15 percent, wages have actually gone down. So the tie between productivity and wages no longer exists because of this new global market that we are in, which is a major public policy issue, Madam Speaker.

And then, finally, the share of national income in 2003 and 2004. This is the change. The change. The bottom 99 percent, their share of national income went down 2 percent. The top 1 percent, they went up 2 percent. And the top .01 percent went up 1 percent. So you can see that the bottom, the 99 percent hasn't benefited from what is going on here, and the top 1 percent has. So the question is what do we do, and what have we already done?

If you look at what the new Democratic majority has already done, Mr. MEEK, they have already, in the first 100 hours, made strides to try to rectify this. Passed the minimum wage to try to give the American people a pay raise to \$7.25 an hour, and that means thousands of dollars a year depending on how many minimum-wage workers or how many minimum-wage jobs you perform. It could mean a couple thousand dollars a year. In addition to that, we have cut student loan interest rates in half for both parent loans and student loans, which will save the average person taking out a loan about \$4,400. So you add the minimum wage. And in addition to that, we were able, in the first 100 hours, through the leadership of Speaker PELOSI, to also repeal corporate welfare and invest that money in new alternative energy sources. We passed the stem cell research bill, and alternative energy and stem cells are going to open up two new sectors of the economy. And then in addition to that, we were able to pass and give permission to the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate down drug prices on behalf of the Medicare recipients.

So this package, the first 100-hour package, has done a lot to try to ad-

dress some of these problems: Boost the minimum wage, cut student loan interest rates in half, and allow drug prices to be negotiated so that we will actually reduce the burden that is being placed on people.

So, Mr. MEEK, I think there has been a lot that has been done. There has been a lot that has been done here on behalf of the American people just in the first 100 hours, and we are going to continue to move on global climate change, global warming. We are going to continue to move on alternative energy. We are going to move on research and development. We are going to continue to provide the kind of oversight that the American people deserve in order to fix some of these problems.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Reclaiming my time, Mr. RYAN, I am just so glad you had those charts to really spell out what the President's budget wants to do to Americans versus for Americans.

And I think it is very, very important that we continue to march on and do the things that we need to do to represent the American people, Madam Speaker. The reason why we come to the floor to point some of these issues out, this is an unopened copy of the budget that we received this week here in the Capitol, in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, and it is our job to look through this budget and see what is good and what is bad for the American people.

The American people delivered this people's House a change. The change for accountability, the change for oversight, and the change to be able to make sure that this country moves in the right direction. America said they want to move in a new direction. We said we wanted to move them in a new direction and that we were going to be a part of that atmosphere.

The reason why we are pointing these things out, Madam Speaker, is because we want to make sure the Members know the work we have before us not only on the Ways and Means Committee, but also on the Budget Committee. Every Member of this House, their said committees are having hearings now, need it be the Secretary of Education or the Secretary of Labor or even the EPA Administrator, to come before their said committees of jurisdiction to talk about why they submitted certain things in the budget, need it be the environment or education or justice or what have you.

But I think it is very, very important to point out how this budget continues to move in the wrong direction, the President's budget, as it relates to the growth of our country and the health of our local communities and States. I learned a term about 8 years ago when I was in the State legislature, and it is called "devolution of taxation." Cut the taxes at the Federal level, and pass unfunded mandates down to the States and local government. And in this budget I see the President continues to embrace that philosophy, devolution of taxation.

Let me go further on in that definition of "devolution of taxation." Here in Washington, D.C., we have made a paradigm shift in this House to use the philosophy of pay as we go. We want to show how we are going to pay for it if we are going to fund it, not pay for it and continue to work on this chart and borrowing from foreign nations and owing foreign nations money, as the Republican Congress did and the President did. What we want to do is do it in a responsible way.

But as we start talking about devolution of taxation, when you cut opportunities for local government, and some statistics have shown that as it relates to this budget, from the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, they estimate the total aid to States and local governments will decline, has declined \$12.7 billion. So we pass this on to the States, and they have to fill the gap that we are not willing to fill, or obviously the President is not willing to fill, that we are going to try to do our best to fill here in this House of Representatives. They have to rob from Peter to pay Paul. Well, who is Peter? Nine times out of ten, it is a person that is trying to educate him or herself or their family, or grandparents that are trying to educate their children, that the tuition at the State university system is going to up.

□ 1630

The assistance for the elderly in a said State may end up being cut. Health care to children and other opportunities that States like to provide for the citizens of their State will end up being cut because they have to fill the gap that the Federal Government is not filling.

Then, on top of that, it continues to roll down, because, by constitution, by all State constitutions, they have to balance. They don't have the prerogative of saying, we will put it on a credit card or borrow from a foreign nation. They have to balance their budget. So they balance their budget on the backs of local government. Then the local government has to figure out how they are going to raise money, be it needed for education, school districts, or needed for local county or city commissions. Then they end up putting some sort of levy or penny tax or referendum on the local communities and voting for transportation needs or voting for parks and recreation.

The reason why that is happening more and more in U.S. cities is because of the kind of budget that the President sent to the Hill on the backs of the American people.

Now, what else is in this budget? You have to think about, this budget is standing for the individuals that are not even asking for tax cuts to be made permanent on behalf of wealthy Americans.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. If the gentleman will yield, I think this is very illustrative of your point. Here we said earlier, the share of the national income

went up 2 percent for those people in the top 1 percent of the country. The bottom 99 percent, their share of the national income went down 2 percent.

Add on that what you are saying, okay, what you just said about the devolution of taxation. Okay. So now these are the same people who have to vote on property tax issues. These are the same people who have to vote on libraries. These are the same people that have to vote on the penny sales tax to keep their counties running. So I think they are getting squeezed from all sides.

Then, when you look at what the top 1 percent have benefited from the globalization of America and the ability to be in the stock market and benefit from that, and get tax cuts and the tax loopholes and everything else, the bottom line is, Mr. MEEK, the bottom 99 percent have not benefited from all of this.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. RYAN, once again, thank you for your charts, sir, because we need to make sure the Members know exactly what was handed down from the President of the United States to this Congress and the work that we have cut out.

Some tough decisions are going to have to be made, Madam Speaker. Some millionaire may not get all of the tax break they have been waiting and counting on from the President of the United States. We have hard-working Americans out there looking for a break. We have small businesses out there looking for a break. Meanwhile, the President says, make my original thoughts permanent because I had a rubber stamp Congress in the 109th and 108th and so on, that did what I said do, continue that, and let's cut assistance to State and local governments. Let's cut the COPS Program. Let's cut Medicaid benefits. Let's make life harder for veterans as it relates to their benefits and the clinics that are open out there, that we just did something about in the continuing resolution. Let's continue that philosophy.

But for those individuals that are being driven and buying new cars every other year, let's continue to make life wonderful for them. And, by the way, let me send an escalation of more troops over to Iraq, where we just had a hearing just yesterday here in the House of Representatives that we are now getting down to the nitty gritty on what happened to \$8 billion that no one can account for that was cash money. Very little of it can be accounted for, very little. Eighty percent can't be accounted for. Let's continue to practice that philosophy in Iraq.

So, Mr. RYAN, the only, I guess, comfort that I have at this moment is the fact that the American people voted to move in a new direction, Madam Speaker, and we are willing to take them in that direction. But, at the same time, Mr. RYAN, the philosophy of the 30-Something Working Group, we want to make sure that every Member understands their responsibility.

We have Veterans' Day coming up. We have Memorial Day coming up. We have a number of holidays that are recognizing the contributions of Americans that allowed us to salute one flag. The least that we can do is break it down to the point that every Member understands his or her responsibility in the House of Representatives.

So, if you want to be on the side of the super, super billionaires and millionaires, you make that choice. If you want to be on the side of the American people that work hard every day, to give them some sort of break so hopefully they can pay for tuition to make sure their children can make it through college, and, as Mr. RYAN said, in the first 100 hours, we dealt with a lot of that. We dealt with the minimum wage, which is now coming back from the Senate that will be over here in the House either today or tomorrow, or is already here. We dealt with the issue of being able to make a reverse about face on the interest rates that the previous Congress put on students and their families. We rolled that back.

There are a number of things that we have already put through the process, pay-as-you-go principles here in this House, to put this country on the right track.

Yes, tough decisions have to be made. But, at the same time, we have to be responsible, and we can't just rely on sound bites as though, well, that will get us past the process.

I believe that we can make it to the promised land, not through doing the same thing expecting different results, but having the kind of oversight and having the kind of foresight and watching out for these individuals.

Weatherization. You mentioned weatherization, Mr. RYAN, as it relates to keeping our most frail and poor warm during the wintertime. The President is asking to keep a tax cut permanent for super billionaires but cut weatherization assistance for a lady on fixed income in Detroit, Michigan.

I am just trying to understand the balance here and the priorities as we start to look at this. The President is asking for a cut in a number of the Department of Justice programs, Madam Speaker, that assist local sheriffs and police chiefs in combating and preventing crime. The COPS Program, zeroed out.

The President last week, Mr. RYAN, had an announcement come out that we are going to move for the maximum Pell Grant. Then the budget comes out, and it is the same level of what he has recommended over the last 4 years. So, the words don't match the action.

So our job here in the House, Madam Speaker and Members, is to make sure that even if the President makes a commitment to the American people and we agree with that commitment, that we have to find some room in this budget, which I know that Chairman SPRATT and other members of the Budget Committee and members of

committees that have jurisdiction and oversight, will have some say in how we move in the new direction as it relates to America. So we are going to have a serious paradigm shift.

I see Mr. RYAN here has one of our favorite charts out right now just to illustrate what past budgets have done, Madam Speaker, and where it left this Congress in spending the majority of its money, not on the priority that the majority of the American people would like us to balance on but because of bad management.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I appreciate your insight, Mr. MEEK. You have talked about this, and we have been talking about this for a long time.

We would love to come in, as the Democrats did in January and swore in Speaker PELOSI, and come in and bump the Pell Grant up two thousand bucks and eliminate student loans altogether as far as paying interest on them and all kinds of other things we would like to do. But we are limited by the kind of budget that we have inherited from the President in a 6-year presidency and a 14-year Republican control of this Chamber.

Here is what they are doing: The 2008 budget authority says that the red on the left, \$230 billion or \$240 billion a year, is going to be spent just paying the interest on the money that this country has borrowed; not to pay down the debt, but just to pay the interest payments. We are going to have to spend \$230 billion because of that. Look how that just dwarfs other priorities in the budget of the United States.

The next one is education. The next one is veterans. The next one is homeland security. All pale in comparison to what we are forced to spend to pay the interest on the money we are borrowing.

As Mr. MEEK has said in his previous chart, this money, over \$1 trillion, has come from foreign interests. This President and the Republican Congress borrowed more in 4 years from foreign interests than all of the previous Presidents and Congresses combined. Combined. This is the net result, the interest that we have to pay on the debt.

So what has happened is that we have a huge number; \$2.102 trillion in 2006 is the amount of foreign held debt, \$2 trillion. That is unacceptable in the most powerful, wealthiest country on the face of this Earth.

So we have seen what has happened since the Clinton administration had some sanity. We had a \$5.6 trillion projected surplus. It went down \$8.4 trillion. Now we are in a \$2.8 trillion deficit. We have some real problems.

So when it goes to making the investments that we want to make in education, the investments that we want to make in health care, SCHIP, the COPS Program, making sure young kids are covered, have some form of health care coverage, Madam Speaker, we are limited by the budget that we have been handed.

Unfortunately, we can't start from scratch, but there are some decisions



that need to be made, and I can tell you that it is not acceptable to me, and I know it is not acceptable to my friend from Florida, to continue to allow people who make millions and millions and millions of dollars a year to continue to get a tax cut.

Some may say they earn it. Maybe they do. Some do. And some work hard. Just because you wear a white collar doesn't mean you don't work hard. But what we are saying is, that group of people benefit the most from the lavishness that this country has given them, the roads and the bridges and the safety and the security provided by defense, the stable markets in which to invest money, in which many, many do, into the stock market. This is all provided for by the stability that comes out of this institution, and therefore they owe a little bit back.

Now, even if you don't believe that, our alternative, we have a decision to make: Either we borrow this money from the Chinese, the Japanese and the OPEC countries, which gets us to that chart where there is \$2 trillion in foreign-held debt by this country, or we ask those people who are making millions and millions of dollars a year, Mr. MURPHY, to pay their fair share, to step up to bat and help us solve this problem that we have so we don't have to put the future of our kids and our grandkids in the hands of Communist China.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Ohio. As you dig deeper into this budget, Mr. RYAN, what you find is the financial gimmickry involved in the President's claim that this budget will be balanced by 2012 is accomplished by forgetting about this little thing that hides in our Tax Code called the Alternative Minimum Tax. That is a difficult concept for some people to understand, but it is not going to be so difficult for millions of middle-class families to figure out when, next year and the year after that, they are going to be hit for the first time with a massive new tax increase.

The Alternative Minimum Tax was introduced first to try to make sure that those at the highest end of income scales were forced to pay some type of income tax. But because we haven't adjusted that number over the years, more and more middle-class families are going to fall into that trap.

Mr. RYAN, you are exactly right. You and Mr. MEEK and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ have talked about the fact that, during a time in which we are expending vast amounts of money overseas while we have major overdue investments here at home, we are giving away this multi-billion dollar tax cut to the richest 1 percent of Americans. That is wrong. We need to reinvest that money back into our infrastructure, back into education and energy and all of the things that help regular families.

But what we need to tell people about is, this budget not only decreases

taxes for folks at the very top of the income echelon, but it also raises taxes on middle-income folks, because the President in this budget does nothing to address that looming Alternative Minimum Tax.

It is kind of a difficult subject to talk about, because it is complex tax policy, and you have to dig a little bit into that income tax form to figure out how much it is going to hit you. But it is going to hit you.

□ 1645

And unless we do something about it, we are not just going to have a tax decrease for those at the top, we are going to have a big tax increase for those in the middle. And as we know, this budget does nothing to help the costs that all the middle-class families are facing. Their premiums go up every year from their employer, as the cost of higher education spirals, as we know, a 41 percent increase since 2001. This budget does nothing, little if nothing, to help those families.

So, Mr. RYAN, this is a double whammy for American taxpayers. Not only are we sucking money out of the budget by giving away tax breaks to the very wealthiest, but we are then very explicitly hammering those in the middle income.

But here is the good news. We know what the good news is, is that, as you have said, in previous years that budget which stands in front of Mr. MEEK would have been delivered to Congress and would have had a little cursory look by the Members here and would have sailed out basically intact, at least when it comes to those priorities.

This year it is very different. And by the grace of the American people that sent a new Democratic Congress here, that budget is going to have a very, very hard look, and it is going to look very, very different when it leaves here, Mr. RYAN.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And you are right. In years gone by, they would have greased that sucker up, and it would have flown through the House and the Senate, who knows what kind of changes. It wasn't until in the last year or so that the Republican majority at that point couldn't even agree with each other. So we have had to come in and clean up with the continuing resolution, which we made some great advances with veterans and some other issues that we were able to deal with.

But when you look at it, we don't want to get into, and you are exactly right, there is going to be an increase in taxes if the President's budget over the next few years stays, because that alternative minimum tax is going to creep in and is going to creep in to average American families' lives, middle-income families. And so I appreciate you making that point.

We have been joined by a special guest who periodically jumps in and joins with the 30-something Working Group, the gentlewoman from Texas. I would be happy to yield.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished gentleman. It is a delight to be here with all of my colleagues, and I might say that it is a pleasure to jump in and to accept the glory of the 30-something once in a while, particularly on this very vital and important issue.

And I want to say to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, having watched the Ohio election process; if there was a State that spoke loudly about a decided necessity of change, it certainly was Ohio, and the rest of us followed. And I can't imagine that we would be facing this budget but for mistakes and missteps that have been made in foreign policy, for example the Iraq war and funding that has been somewhat misplaced.

But the good news is, and that is what I wanted to just focus on for a moment, that we now have the opportunity; Speaker PELOSI, the leadership, Chairman DINGELL, Chairman WAXMAN on the health issues, we now have an opportunity to address the American people and to, frankly, make sure that we listen.

I want to start very briefly on tracking the reauthorization of the Ryan White bill that was authorized in the last Congress. But an authorization goes nowhere unless there is, if you will, the funding that is necessary. And so I just wanted to briefly highlight the fact that we have a continuing AIDS crisis in the United States which really requires a focused and concerted effort at funding. And I don't believe that with the President's budget, these enormous tax cuts, we will be able to address the fact that there are now over 1 million people in the United States living with AIDS, and that particular communities, African Americans and Hispanics, are disproportionately affected by HIV/AIDS, and they account for nearly 50 percent of the people living with HIV/AIDS.

That means that we need more Federal funds made available to help in the minority health initiatives, the AIDS initiatives, and we need more funds to encourage testing for as many people as possible. So I cite that as a challenge to this budget that is going to impact many of us extremely negatively.

Then I would encourage my colleagues from the various States, 50 States, to take a litmus test or to take a thermometer and measure the temperature of the President's budget against the health of your State.

Let me just share with you what is going to happen to the State of Texas. We have a sizable young population, the State of Texas. Most of our population is under the age of 25; we have an extensive population of under 5, and we need, if you will, a refocus on the domestic agenda for this country.

I am looking forward to Chairman SPRATT's, the Budget Committee's reforming of the President's budget because this is what will happen to Texas: Two million Texans could see

retirement benefits cut under the President's privatization proposal that is in his budget. And I would simply ask the question, how many times do we have to say that privatization of Social Security will not work? And it will not work.

The President's health care proposal will squeeze Texas middle class of more cost and less coverage. So the President's health insurance proposal, which is opposed by my public health system, Harris County, who says, "Are you trying to close our doors?" We will see a squeeze on the middle class; 5.5 million uninsured in the State of Texas will be impacted.

Let me give three other points. Huge Medicare cuts which we are seeing in the President's budget would endanger 2.5 million Texan Medicare beneficiaries' access to quality care and impose new taxes on seniors. The one thing our seniors said on the prescription benefit part D, no more burdens, no more doughnut holes. And that is what the President's budget gives us.

In addition, one of the greatest tragedies of the President's budget is the cut in the State grants for children's health insurance could add some 1.4 million children to the uninsured ranks in Texas. Now, they say that they are going to leave this to the States. The States need to find out how to handle this. This is, this is, this is comedic. This is joking. This is completely impossible. I am lacking for words. We are fighting in our State to be able to insure children who need to be insured, and you are telling us we will give you, the State, a certain amount of money, and it is how you do it. It is not how we do it. We can't do it without the funding. So you are going to deepen the hole of health disparities by suggesting that we cut off 1.4 million uninsured children in the State of Texas.

I would ask my colleagues to check the temperature of their State by taking a thermometer and measuring the President's budget against the needs of the American people. In Texas, 1.6 million veterans could be hurt by VA funding shortfalls. And I spent time with homeless veterans in my community at stand-down. I have homeless veterans in shelters in my community, as many of us do, but I see many of my homeless veterans under our bridges. We can't afford any more cuts in veterans health coverage because they are already paying the maximum amount.

Let me conclude by suggesting that we likewise have made a commitment, 30-something and 30-something-plus, have made a commitment to America's youth. We want to ensure that the doors of our institutions are open. And just today I heard the fact that in our own community in Houston, we don't enough seats in colleges to be able to help educate young people. This may be a phenomenon across American in many communities, and that means we are closing the door to higher education to our children. Well, the budget that the President has put forward, aid

for Texas college students, may be whacked again; and, therefore, tuition increases may go up almost 100 percent, because under State laws that we have in the State of Texas, we give that latitude to our universities. Our students cannot be whacked again, and they can't take the burden again.

So I am hoping that, in addition to cutting the Department of Homeland Security, which we will obviously not tolerate because we are certainly not, we have not met the test of the 9/11 Commission Report, this budget needs fixing, it needs a fixing, and we need to rally around the American people's voice of health care, education, security, and the environment and affordable energy before we allow this budget to come to the floor of this House. And I hope that we will have the opportunity to be able to work our will, the will of the American people, and work our will on behalf of seniors, on behalf of those suffering with AIDS in minority populations and other, on behalf of the working middle-class families that struggle every day, that we would choose them over outrageous tax cuts that have been proposed by this President's budget.

And I thank the distinguished gentlemen for allowing me to participate and to acknowledge that these policies are not family-friendly. And I look forward to a budget coming to this floor that we pass, the majority, Democrats, with our friends on the other side of the aisle, that will be family-friendly, children-friendly, those who are suffering from various diseases, education-friendly, environment-friendly, and certainly a new day in energy by the budget that we put forward on this floor.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We thank the gentlewoman. As we have been saying in the last few weeks here and the last few days especially, that years ago that budget would come and get greased up and come right through this Chamber and on to the other side of Capitol Hill and get signed into law, with the tax cuts for the top 1 percent and cuts to the kids. And now NANCY PELOSI stands between that budget and the American people, and we are going to make sure, and our friend from Florida. So we thank you for joining us. It is always a special treat for our friend to come down from Texas. And I would be happy to yield to our friend from Florida, who is standing to be recognized.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Thank you, Mr. RYAN, for yielding to me. And I just think it is important that we have this dialogue here on the floor, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, just to make sure that we prepare the Members for the decisions that have to be made.

We talk about bipartisanship a lot, and I have my information here to talk about some of the votes that we have moved on this floor in a bipartisan nature, and I know I will have it in a minute, that kind of set a tone through this Chamber that we can work to-

gether, Madam Speaker, when the ideas are good and when they are sound.

And I know that the budget is probably one of the most partisan votes that we have taken in past Congresses, especially the last two that I have been involved in, Mr. RYAN. But the way the President's budget has been drawn up, with cuts of 20 percent to first responder grants and high-threat and high-density areas, and a cut in State grants as relates to training and buying equipment and conducting exercises for their first responders by 64 percent, for many of the Members on both sides of the aisle that talk a lot about the war on terror, we have to make sure we are prepared.

All of these things, all of these speeches that people come to the floor and make, Members of Congress, this budget is not in the spirit of those speeches. And I think it is important that those Members on both sides of the aisle, and I would say mainly with my Republican colleagues, that they start preparing their leadership now on the things that they can vote for. And I know that making tax cuts permanent for the superbillionaires is not something that is going to fly back home.

Now, I was thinking about staying in the majority always, which is not a bad idea, but if that was my paramount reason for being here on this floor, then I wouldn't say out loud that they need to start telling their minority party, on the Republican side of the aisle, that there is things that I have to vote for. I am not willing to cut veteran benefits. I am not willing to not do the things that we need to do for the children of America. I am not willing to not give the middle class a tax cut or give billionaires a tax cut. I am not willing to cut local government assistance, especially in the area of homeland security and other areas of law enforcement. I am not willing to do those things because I don't think my constituents will send me back to Congress.

That is the kind of discussion they need to be having with their leadership, because one thing that I have seen, Madam Speaker, especially with the past votes that we have taken on the minimum wage, on taking big-time subsidies from oil companies, on the whole issue of cutting tuition, on the issue of a few of the other packages that we passed, but on the main issue as it relates to how we are going to move from this point of pay as you go, I have noticed that the leadership on the Republican side have voted opposite of the majority of the Members of the House, with some Republicans joining us on those votes, or we are voting together. I hate to say joining us, because it seems like it is something that was a last-minute thought.

□ 1700

No, they were great ideas, and they need to be passed, and they were passed overwhelmingly.

But as it relates to this budget, this is going to be one of the most important documents that we pass in the 110th Congress' first session, and I think it is important that Members start talking to their leadership now and saying this to the Republican side about the votes that they cannot and the votes that they will take.

Now, I have watched in the 109th Congress the moderate Members on the Republican side who went to their leadership and tried to make things happen, and you know something, if the leadership would have listened to some of the moderate Members of the Republican Party on the other side of the aisle, maybe, just maybe, the majority on the Democratic side would not be as wide as it is.

Now, the American people want us to move as one, not just as Democrats and Republicans. They want us to move in a responsible way that will lead this country in a new direction; not in a Democratic direction, not in a Republican direction, not in an Independent direction, but in a new direction.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. For America.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Which is good and as American as apple pie and Chevy trucks and what have you. But I think it is important that we say this out loud, because when we get around budget time, there is a lot of interesting things that are said on the floor. Some Members are even gaveled down for some of these statements because they try to justify a good or bad vote.

With the continuing resolution that was passed, we saw a little spike in Members having to reflect back on to the rules, the Parliamentarian running around the floor saying, you cannot say that, you cannot do this. Before we get all animated and excited about this budget, I just want to make sure that the Members understand that you have to start having that discussion with your party leaders, especially on the Republican side of the aisle.

Now, let us just look at this. On the 9/11 Commission, 68 Republicans voted with 231 Democrats to do what the bipartisan Commission said we should do in protecting America, but the shocking part is that 128 Republicans decided not to vote with the majority of the Members of the House, Republicans and Democrats. What is going on there? The American people cannot understand that overwhelmingly.

Minimum Wage Act, 82 Republicans voted with the majority of the supermajority and every last Democrat, 233, voted to give the American people a pay raise after years and years and years, and as you can see here, Madam Speaker, over the years under the Republican Congress, Member of Congress did not have a problem in giving themselves a pay raise until the Democratic majority put a stop to it, saying that we will not agree to a pay raise until the American people get one. But 116 Republicans voted against it for people who were making \$5.15 an hour. It reminds me of the President saying, let

us make those tax cuts permanent for superbillionaires, and let us forget about the middle class, and let us cut programs on the local level for the most fragile Americans.

Stem cell research, again bipartisan vote. A number of Republicans voted against it. Medicare prescription drug price negotiating, 24 Republicans joined 231 Democrats; 170 Republicans voted against it. College Student Loan Relief Act, 232 Democrats voted for it, 124 Republicans voted for it, supermajority Members of the House, 71 Republicans, hard-core holdouts, on the bipartisan spirit. Held out again on creating long-term energy alternatives for the Nation Act; 228 Democrats voted for it, 36 Republicans voted for it, 159 Republicans voted against it.

I am saying all of this, and I am not trying to speak fast on this, Madam Speaker, I am just saying that if we are going to come together as a country, and we are going to work in a bipartisan way, now here I am in the majority saying that it is important that we work in a bipartisan way.

Madam Speaker, I know the officers of the House who have witnessed many of these 30-something sessions that we have had in the minority. They were like some of them Tivo'd it when we were on break because they just heard it so many times, and they wanted to hear it again. If I have said it once, I have said it 30 times: Bipartisanship can only be allowed when the majority allows it.

Now we have the will and the desire by the Speaker of the House of Representatives that has said that she wants to move in a bipartisan way, and we still have Republicans that are saying, no, we do not; we want to be different, even when we are wrong. And that is not the philosophy that the American people have embraced. I do not care if it is a Republican voter or Independent voter or Democratic voter, the American spirit will prevail, and that is what happened last November.

So we have some individuals that are saying, we are willing to continue to hold on to the old way versus moving in a new direction. I am not trying to be offensive. I am just saying, I am reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the vote chart. I am trying to encourage folks to work in a bipartisan way. So let us have the discussion now in the Budget Committee, in the Ways and Means Committee, and discussions in committees of jurisdictions standing. Let us have those arguments, but let us come together on the fiber of the budget and for us to be fiscally sound and for us to be able to move this country in a new direction.

That has nothing to do with what the Republican leadership may believe what is right or the Democrat leadership believes what is right. It is what is right for America.

So we are willing to do that. Pollwise, the American people are on the side of doing things that we are trying to outline here and that we are

speaking against in this budget, and as we move through that process, I look forward to not only fruitful debate, but I look forward to a paradigm shift in the minority side, in a number of double-digit, hopefully triple-digit, Republicans voting for a budget that comes before this floor that this House hammers out.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I am not sure that I believe the people were Tivo-ing, but if they were, it was only because of your eloquence when you talk about issues like bipartisanship, because you should be right to crow.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Please mention Mr. RYAN's name. He gets a little jealous when folks started mentioning the fact I make a good argument on bipartisanship, so, please.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I hear people talk about him as well.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield? I have family members who have Tivo'd, okay.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. So here is what those of us who are new to this Chamber sort of see from the outside, and I think it probably matches up with what Mr. RYAN and Mr. MEEK keep seeing from the inside.

What used to happen here was that the agenda that came before the House was decided essentially by folks sitting in the third floor of the Republican National Committee, a bunch of Republican Party insiders who decided that they were going to put a Republican agenda on the floor. They were going to put a party agenda on the floor at the exclusion of the minority party.

So what you saw, for those us that turned on C-SPAN late at night when we were not watching the 30-somethings, we saw votes go up on the screen. And everybody sees those C-SPAN votes where they have got Republicans in one column, Democrats in the other column. You see all the Republicans voting one way, all the Democrats voting the other way, vote after vote after vote, because what was being put before this House was a Republican agenda. Occasionally you would have some people slide over, but by and large that is what you saw.

Here is the difference. The agenda that was part of the first 100 hours and the agenda that was behind the continuing resolution, as Mr. MEEK says, if we have anything to do with it, the agenda that will underlie the budget that finally arrives before this body is not going to be a Democratic agenda. It is not going to be a Democratic budget. It is going to be a people's agenda. It is going to be a budget that comes from the voices and the concerns and the hopes and the fears of people back in all of our districts, Republicans and Democrat.

That is why you see on the 100 hours agenda and even on the continuing resolution, which is probably maybe the most controversial piece of legislation that came before that, even on the continuing resolution, the bill that kept the Federal Government going for the

next few months, you have Republican votes, because no longer is the legislation that gets put before us a partisan agenda. It is now a people's agenda.

And for someone who spent the last 2 years in my district campaigning to come here, talking to people that were so utterly frustrated with what was happening in Washington, yes, people were angry about the agenda here from issue to issue. They were upset that people were not listening to them about their concerns on rising energy prices, rising health care prices, why they could not send their kids to college. But they were maybe more overarchingly concerned with the tone this place had taken, and I think that is our lasting legacy, because, as I think I said the first time that I got to talk with you both on this floor, our legacy as a Congress may be that we have some small role in restoring people's faith in government.

When we go around and talk to elementary schools, we are talking to some of the most cynical 10-year-olds you have ever seen, because all they think government is is a bunch of people fighting with each other, yelling at each other, disagreeing instead of agreeing.

So what we do here is we are going to start putting those middle-class families first. That is what this budget will be about. If we can do it with Republicans, and when you do it with Democrats, in the end we make people believe a little bit again in government.

And for those of us who are in this 30-something caucus who might be around long enough to hopefully see government do a few more good things over the next 10, 20, 30, 40 years, that could be one of the most important things we can do.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I appreciate that. As we are wrapping things up, I found it interesting, I saw as we are talking about budget priorities and the kind of investments that we want to make as a country, looking at what the Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke has to say and what he said yesterday and was quoted in the Wall Street Journal and a lot of other media outlets.

Focusing on, and I will say, and I will quote, he said, Ben Bernanke said, The best way to narrow the gap between high-income and low-wage workers in the U.S. would be to strengthen education and training programs.

That is our call, and that is the mission for us, to make sure that average people have the skills and the tools and the opportunity with the increase in the Pell Grants, with what we already did by cutting student loan interest rates in half for both parent and student loans, cutting that in half and giving thousands of dollars back to those families. Those are the kinds of things that we need to continue to do, and No Child Left Behind and everything else.

So we need to make sure that as we reform these systems, we also provide the resources, as we started this, for

the local level to make sure they can get the job done.

We are just wrapping up. We only have 1 minute. I want to give out Speaker PELOSI's e-mail, 30-Something Working Group e-mail, 30somethingdems@mail.house.gov, or you can come to our Web site, www.speaker.gov/30something.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I thank Mr. RYAN for doing such an outstanding job. I thought Mr. MURPHY had the assignment, but I can see you have taken responsibility to do that.

Madam Speaker, we would like to thank the Speaker and the majority leader and majority whip and others for allowing the 30-Something Working Group to come to the floor once again. It was an honor to address the House of Representatives.

#### REPUBLICAN STUDY COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SOLIS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Madam Speaker, I would like to take this first moment to recognize my colleague from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. CAMPBELL for yielding to me, and I appreciate Mr. RYAN sticking around after the Special Order and the work that you have done. Over the last 2-plus years, we spent a lot of hours here on the floor together. It occurred to me as I arrived on the floor—

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Not necessarily together, but on the floor. Not necessarily together.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I would concede that point that not necessarily together, but on the floor. We have been together in some other things as well.

But the point that occurred to me as I arrived here on the floor this afternoon is we often do not commingle our policies. We have an argument that is set separate on this side and on that side, and it occurred to me that Lincoln and Douglas had some effective debates that were very, very instructive, and it helped the people understand the distinctions between the policies.

So as I mull this around in my mind, it occurs to me to offer an invitation that if our side could set aside an hour Special Order, and if your side would be interested in setting aside an hour Special Order, we could merge those together and then perhaps three from your side, three from our side, and we could spend 2 hours with an open debate type of a format so that we could have a free exchange with the best of attitude and comity. I think that would be a very good thing to do for the people across this country as they review what is going on here on the floor.

I would ask your opinion on that.

□ 1715

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I appreciate the gentleman's opportunity. Those decisions are made above my pay grade, but I can honestly say that we have numerous debates on this floor, which I think have been significant and monumental, especially in the first 100 hours, as we have talked about here. I don't exactly know how to respond to you. I think we do have adequate debate here, depending on what the issue of the day is, both sides getting an opportunity to do that.

We get our hours and talk about the things that we want to talk about, and you get your hour to talk about what you want to talk about. There can be, I am sure, some discussion. If there is room for us, as we push certain policies, that is what we are here to talk about. That is the issue of the day.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. You are welcome to respond to that.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time. If the gentleman would be interested, I would suggest you take it up above that pay grade and see if you come back with a positive response. I didn't check with anybody above me. I happened to be able to claim some time on the floor and make that decision.

I offer that openly with the best intentions. I think 2 hours would be a very good thing for all of us to have that discussion. The offer is there. I leave it on the table, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I appreciate the gentleman making the offer. Last year or 2 years ago, we were asking for opportunities to speak on the floor. We weren't given that opportunity, but I will take it to the leadership, and we will take that under consideration.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I would point out that, as we have had exchanges here during special orders, I am one who has yielded, especially to Uncle BILL from Massachusetts. I would point that out. That is a matter of record. We can continue in that vein, I would hope.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. In spite of your age discrimination, we will take it under consideration.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you very much, Mr. RYAN.

I yield back to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Thank you, Mr. KING.

We are talking about the budget this evening, and a number of things about the budget. The problem out there: We have a deficit. The problem is not that people are taxed too little; it is the government is spending too much.

I didn't just make that up. I didn't come up with that now. I am paraphrasing the words of President Ronald Reagan and comments he made several decades ago. But it is every bit as true today as it was then. The reason that we have a deficit, the issues with our government budget, are not that people

are taxed too little; it is that government spends too much.

Why, as a matter of fact, since 2003, revenues to the Federal Government, income to the Federal Government, have increased by 46 percent, assuming that this year it continues at the rate that the increases have begun this year, 46 percent since 2003.

Let me put that in a way maybe that folks listening can understand even more clearly. If you are making \$50,000 a year in 2003, in order for your income to keep up with what the Federal Government's income has been, you would have to be making over \$72,000 today, not bad. I bet most of you out there listening, if you were making \$50,000 back in 2003, would be pretty happy if you had gotten raises to be at \$72,000 or \$73,000 today. But that is where the Federal Government is.

But what's interesting is, that is not because taxes were increased. That 46 percent increase in revenue is because taxes were decreased, because there were tax cuts in 2003.

Because there were tax cuts in 2003, a whole bunch of good things happened: More people are working. The unemployment rate is down. Business investment is up. Gross domestic product is up, and millions and millions of new jobs have been created. All that since these tax cuts that are so demagogued by the other side. Now, the people who spoke in the hour before me here were talking about tax cuts for the rich, and I think they said super billionaires or something like that.

Let us talk about what these tax reductions were. One of them was a reduction in the tax on capital gains and dividends. Let's see. Over 50 percent of Americans now own stocks or have been investing in the stock market. So I guess over 50 percent of Americans must be hyper billionaires because capital gains and dividends tax cuts saved them money.

Almost 70 percent of Americans own homes. When you sell your home at some point, you might be subject to a capital gains tax. I guess almost over 70 percent of Americans are hyper billionaires or the super rich.

Or perhaps the marriage penalty reduction, which saved money for every married taxpayer. I guess that means everyone who is married is a hyper billionaire type of rich.

Not true, but what is particularly interesting is that these tax reductions, these tax rate reductions, saved Americans at all income levels money, and it resulted in the economy growing, which is why you have had this 46 percent increase in revenue.

But even with that 46 percent increase in revenue, we still have a deficit, because we are spending too much. Now, the other side does have a tax that they don't like, which is interesting. It is the alternative minimum tax.

Now, I stand before you as a Member of Congress, yes, but also as a certified public accountant and an individual

with a master's in business taxation. So I do have a little bit of knowledge in the area of taxation. The alternative minimum tax is pretty complicated. But basically you figure your tax on a regular tax, and then there is another tax, and you pay whichever one is greater.

The alternative minimum tax only kicks in if it results in more tax than the regular tax. The reason that would happen is because you pay a high rate. By definition, if you are not in one of the highest tax brackets, the alternative minimum tax cannot apply to you.

If you were to compare the capital gains tax, alternative minimum tax, and look at which one is more for the rich, it would certainly be the alternative minimum tax. Yet you just heard the Democratic colleagues on the other side of the aisle just say that the capital gains, the dividends, all these tax reductions that were in 2003 are terrible and are hurting the economy, and they are hurting people, and they are only for the super billionaires. But, yes, they insist on doing something to get rid of the alternative minimum tax, which, by definition, can only hit people in the highest tax brackets, can only create more tax for them.

You can't have it both ways, Democrats, you cannot have it both ways. If eliminating or reducing the alternative minimum tax is good policy, then so is reducing the tax on capital gains and on dividends and on the marriage penalty and all the other rate reductions that we did back in 2003.

Now, the President released a budget this week. The budget he released balances in 5 years without raising taxes. The other side of the aisle, the majority here spent the last 2 days saying how terrible it is. I am trying to figure out what is so bad. Is balancing the budget in 5 years bad? I would rather balance it in 2; I would rather balance it in 1, sure.

I don't think balancing the budget in 5 years is that bad of an objective, and it balances it without raising taxes. Ah, that is really the part they don't like, balancing the budget without raising taxes. They don't want that to happen because they want to raise taxes, because a 46 percent income growth since 2003 is not good enough, because increases in jobs, increases in the economy, increases in gross domestic product, that is not good enough, because they want to spend more, more and more and more. They want to tax, and they want to spend.

The new Democrats are the same as the old Democrats. You are seeing it on this floor, in this hall, today, this week and this month. Unfortunately, I am afraid you are going to see it in the months going forward.

So what is the problem with balancing the budget without tax increases? That is what we want to do. That is what the President wants to do. But, unfortunately it is not what the other side wants to do.

Let me take a moment, and if I may, and yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING). Would you like to speak on some of these matters for a few moments?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding to me both times here this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, taking up the issue of the budget that is coming before us and this sense of responsibility and debates that I have had this year and debates that I recall I had in the national media that I had with members of the other party, and some of them took the oath that they would be willing to support a balanced budget without raising taxes; I don't hear any of that talk here on the Democrat side of the aisle. Nobody is stepping forward, and saying, yes, I remember what I said, I didn't mean it, or even, I remember what I said. They seem to have forgotten what they said.

They do say they want to balance the budget. But we also know from listening to Mr. RANGEL, there isn't any one of the Bush tax cuts that he would not want to eliminate, which would result in a tax increase.

Yet we have the strongest economy that we have had in my lifetime, the most consecutive quarters of growth. We have a very healthy unemployment rating of about 4.5 percent, and that has been staying low. Inflation has been staying low. Interest has been staying low. Every economic indicator that is low when it is good is low. Every economic indicator that is high when it is good, it is high. The stock market has reached any number of all-time highs.

These Bush tax cuts, the 2001 cuts and the 2003 cuts were essential and necessary to keep us out of a depression and a recession at a time when the dot.com bubble had burst, when our financial centers were attacked on September 11, and we had to go to war and spend hundreds of billions of dollars to protect the American people, of which there has been no significant attack against Americans by terrorists in our country since that time.

Who would believe that our economy would be this strong, our safety would be this good, that there are so many things sitting where they are today? But we need to step forward and make progress. I can tell you frankly that I was not thrilled by the proposal here several years ago, 3 years ago, that we were going to cut the deficit in half in 5 years. That was not enough for me.

Now, I believe that President Bush has offered a budget, and I think that we will see the House Republicans offer a budget that will reach balance within 5 years. That is a balance without dynamic scoring, and the increase that we are seeing in the revenue because of this dynamic economy indicates that could well happen within the next 3 years. I expect it will happen in the next 3 years.

I am an individual, though, who would be willing to sign on to a budget

that would balance the budget this year. I will not go very far into that for these purposes, because I recognize, practically speaking, there aren't enough votes to pass a budget like that. It would be a bit too Draconian.

But had we have been able to slow some of this growth, we could be at balance today, except that we have been facing the war, and we took the hit from the burst in the dot.com bubble. So we are pulled together here now, and the principle needs to be, slow this growth in discretionary, non-defense discretionary spending. We are doing that, and we have effectively done that. We have kept it at below the rate of inflation or at the rate of inflation.

The biggest problem we have is the constant growth in entitlements called Medicare, Social Security, Medicaid to a lesser degree, and, of course, the interest that goes up on that. You will see a budget comes from Republicans that gets us to a balanced budget within 5 years. I am grateful that that is coming out.

But, again, I believe that if we can give the investors the confidence that we can continue the Bush tax cuts, the 2001 and the 2003 tax cuts, then I think that you will see this economy continue to grow, and you will see the budget balanced before the 5 years are up.

But if we turn this over to the other side, if we turn it over to the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, who wants to see the end of all of those tax cuts, we will see the goose that lays the golden egg slaughtered and on the field of class warfare.

Now, we know that what you tax you get less of. The Federal Government has the first lien on all taxation in America. We tax everything that moves, that produces. We tax labor. We tax interest, investment, dividends capital gains, you name it, all the way down the line. Then the alternative minimum tax sits there and sneaks up on people and grabs people, and it is creeping down into the lower brackets over and over again.

So to make this call, I would say this, extend those tax cuts. The American people need to clamor in order to extend the Bush tax cuts. If that can happen, the confidence in this economy will continue. We will get this budget balanced.

The other side wants a balanced budget, too, because they called for one. But they want to raise your taxes to do it. I guarantee you, that is the only way that they can balance this budget, and that is the effort that they are down on. I stand with the remarks made by the gentleman from California, and I appreciate very much him taking the leadership to come to the floor and yielding to me.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. KING, one second, before you leave, figures, we talk about the progress we have made on this budget so far. The 12-month budget deficit, the last 12

months, is \$188 billion. Remember, some time ago, we were talking about nearly half a trillion dollars. That \$188 billion is down 38 percent as a rolling 12-month budget deficit from what it was a year ago.

For 22 straight months now, the budget deficit has declined by about 18 percent, year on year. There is a lot of progress happening on this budget deficit because of the growth in the economy, because of those tax cuts, and because we, the prior couple of budgets, were beginning to start to control spending. It is something we haven't done, well, frankly, a lot, lately. But we are starting to in the last couple of years. Isn't that right, Mr. KING?

Mr. KING of Iowa. It is interesting to me, the statistics that you put out on that data, that if you believe in a free market economy, you understand that description intuitively. You understand there is going to be dynamic growth that is stimulated because there is a return on investment.

If you don't believe in the free market economy, then you think somehow that people that make money and create jobs are evil, and they should be punished for their productivity. When you punish productivity and tax it, you get less of it. That was another Reagan statement. What you tax you get less of. What you subsidize you get more of.

We are going to see productivity more highly taxed. We get less productivity, and this economy will slow down.

□ 1730

I point also that if we could freeze our spending at current levels, sometime in the middle of fiscal year 2010 we would be looking at a surplus. That is something else to consider.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Speaker, we all understand how much we would rather have the private markets than us making decisions, than some nameless, faceless bureaucrat somewhere close to where we are all sitting right now, someone here in Washington. Someone who fully understands that is my colleague who will be speaking next, Dr. PRICE from the State of Georgia. Dr. PRICE.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from California for yielding and for organizing this and his leadership on this issue. I appreciate your perspective and your expertise as a CPA practicing before you came to Congress. I know that you have the knowledge that all of us should utilize as we talk about budget and the economy.

You know, I was sitting over in my office and listening to our good friends on the other side of the aisle as they were discussing their issues before. I could not help but being amused by their comments. And you sense that they are trying to lay the groundwork now for a budget that they are going to propose, and they are going to propose it obviously with more spending, because that is what our friends on the other side of the aisle do.

But I could not help but just be reminded of the Orwellian sense of how the folks on the other side of the aisle seem to govern. You know, they just seem to think that if they just say it, that it is so. All you have got to do is say it, then it is so. They passed a bill last week that they said did not have any earmarks or any special projects. In fact, it had hundred of millions of dollars of earmarks that they could have taken out; in fact, voted against taking them out.

But I did want to review very briefly, before I mentioned a word or two about the budget and the economy, these wonderful Six for '06 programs that they passed. And of course they are celebrating them as if they were law. However, the Senate has not acted on any of these, so, in fact, they have not become law. And thank goodness they have not become law, because what this highlights is the hypocrisy of our good friends on the other side of the aisle.

They talk about passing all of the 9/11 Commission recommendations. In fact, that is not what they did. That is not what the bill did that they brought to the floor. In fact, they did not pass some of the most important recommendations that allow for communication between committees here that make it so all America would be safer.

They talk about the minimum wage increase. In fact, what they would do if they increased it in the way that they wanted to is to decrease the number of jobs on America and propose this unfunded mandate on American small businesses, which actually cuts the level of employment in our Nation. The Senate has recognized that, and they are working to try to correct the damage that the Democratic House has done.

They denied completely the proven results. I am a physician, practiced medicine for over 20 years before coming to Congress. And the Democratic majority here denied the proven results of adult and cord stem cell research on a bill that they passed here earlier. I suspect the Senate will have to correct the damage that they have done there as well.

As a physician I recognize the importance of doctors and patients making health care decisions by themselves without governmental intervention. And what our good friends on the other side of the aisle did was, in fact, work to fix prices in the area of Medicare prescription drugs, which would decrease the number of drugs available for seniors and, in fact, harm seniors, I believe, in the health care that they receive. And consequently I think the Senate is going to have to work on fixing that.

One of the remarkable hypocritical things that they did in their discussion points about decreasing student loans, in fact that is not what they did at all. What they did was pass a bill that kind of tracks down, decreases the interest on student loans, and then for 6 months



cuts the interest on student loans in half, not for students, though, for graduates; cuts it for 6 months, and then, bam, at the end of that 6 months, the interest rates pop right back up.

Then the most amazing thing that they have done is to tax domestic oil companies, not foreign oil companies, Mr. Speaker, not foreign oil companies. They tax domestic oil companies so that domestic oil costs more, foreign oil costs less. So what will happen is that Americans will be more reliant on foreign oil.

So it is a remarkable, remarkable culture of hypocrisy and misinformation, disinformation, I call it Orwellian government, that our good friends on the other side of the aisle have promoted.

I do want to mention some of economic issues that you had talked about before, the good news, remarkable news in the economy: economic growth, 3.4 percent growth in GDP over the last year; business investment up for 14 straight quarters; job growth of 7.2 million new jobs since the summer of 2003; low unemployment rate, 4.5, 4.6 percent unemployment rate. That is a rate lower than the average of the 1960s, 1970s, 1980s and 1990s combined.

Tax revenues, tax receipts are up. Deficit reduction you mentioned, Mr. CAMPBELL, the latest numbers that are out on the 12-month rolling deficit, the budget deficit, down to \$188 billion. That is the lowest that it has been since 2002. And a steady increase in labor productivity.

So one would think that if our friends on the other side of the aisle were interested in a good economy, they would look at this economy and they would say, well, how did that happen? What made that happen? Were there actions that were taken by the Federal Government and Congress that resulted in those good numbers?

Well, in fact, there were. And they happened in 2001 and 2003, as my friends know, and those were the tax reductions, the appropriate tax reductions on the American people, capital gains, dividends, tax reductions, and a decrease in income tax for the vast majority of Americans. What that did, as it did under President Reagan and as it did under President Kennedy, what that did was to stimulate the economy in a way that resulted in the numbers that we have seen.

And so our good friends on the other side of the aisle would do well to study history. They would do well to study history. They would do well to learn from history as they try to formulate their budget and make certain that they appreciate, as we do on this side of the aisle, that Washington does not have a revenue problem, it has got a spending problem.

We look forward to working with our good friends on the other side of the aisle in decreasing Washington's spending, solving those difficult challenges that we have, as my good friend from Iowa mentioned just a little bit ago, in

the area of Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid, all of those automatic spenders that are comprising more and more of the budget.

I look forward to working with him, I know that my friend from California does, and again I appreciate his leadership and the information that he has been bringing to the floor of the House today and to the American people. Because we are challenged with solving these problems and difficulties that we have as a Nation, we ought to do it together. We are proposing the kind of positive and uplifting messages that I think all America can embrace. I appreciate the time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Thank you, Dr. PRICE.

It is as though the people on the other side, the Democrats, the facts of what is going on in the economy, what is going on in the budget, what tax cuts do, what they do not do, it just does not fit with what they want to do, which is tax more and spend more.

You know, I could put all of you here, keep you in this room where there is no windows, and tell you tomorrow morning that the sun did not rise. Now, you would have no proof that the sun did not rise, but it is very likely that it, in fact, did rise. And the fact that I keep you in this room and do not let you see it does not mean that the sun did not rise.

That is what they are doing. And we are trying to open the windows so people can see, no, you know what, the sun did rise this morning. Tax cuts do stimulate the economy. The budget is moving towards balance. But the problem is spending.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Exactly. I appreciate the gentleman's comments because they are absolutely true. That is why I call it Orwellian politics, bumper sticker politics, because just because they say it is so does not make it so. I appreciate your comments. I know we have got some other colleagues who are interested in shedding light and bringing truth and facts to the issues regarding the budget and the economy.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Well, we do have other speakers. The next one is from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, before I begin my remarks, I would like to call on my fellow Members to keep the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman CHARLIE NORWOOD, in your thoughts and prayers. As many of you know, CHARLIE has suffered from cancer for some time and has fought valiantly, just as he did when he recovered from a lung transplant several years ago.

Today CHARLIE announced that he is going to decline further treatment and return home to Augusta, Georgia, where he will receive hospice care in his home. CHARLIE NORWOOD has served the people his entire life. He has served his Nation as a soldier in Vietnam. He served Augusta, Georgia, but also as a dedicated father to his children, and a husband to his loving wife Gloria.

Since 1995, he has ably and some would say tenaciously represented the people of eastern, northern Georgia, but his service and his wisdom has benefited us all. To me he is not just a great Georgian and a great American, he is a great friend. He served as a mentor to me and to many others in this House. And I know that everyone, Mr. Speaker, here has CHARLIE and Gloria in their thoughts and prayers.

He said today that he is turning it over to the Lord's hands, and I know that he can be in no better place than that. I look forward to working with CHARLIE again. I look forward to him getting back.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that we are talking about the budget and the economy here today, because CHARLIE was a great champion, is a great champion, for the taxpayers of this country, fighting for smaller government, less spending and lower taxes.

In these hallowed halls we hear the word "compassion" when we are talking about spending other people's money, when we are talking about disbursing the hard-earned tax dollars of American workers.

Mr. Speaker, we talk about how important this spending is, how much it is going to help people. Certainly there is no end to the good and well-meaning projects that we could fund. We all want well and qualified students to have the resources they need to go to college. We all want to find an answer to cover the 47 million people who do not have health insurance. We all want to see the benefits that come from new roads, expanded public transportation, infrastructure improvements and economic development projects. We all scrape and fight to ensure that our constituents get their fair share of the Federal pie.

But as we consider the massive spending obligations that our government faces in coming years, everyone in this House, Republican and Democrat, liberal, moderate, conservative, can agree that we cannot stay on our present course.

Mr. Speaker, as the baby-boomers near retirement, we will soon face a scenario where there will not be enough workers to support the entitlement spending slated for Medicare and Social Security. We have talked often in recent years about the funding shortfall that Social Security faces. We know that Social Security will run out of money in less than 50 years.

Perhaps we have focused on Social Security because it seems to be the more manageable problem. As dire as the Social Security situation is, our shortfall in the Medicare program is eight times larger. That should concern not just Members of Congress, but all Americans.

The Medicare shortfall will affect not just retirees and those retiring in the next 10 years, it also is of concern to the younger generations. How will they pay for their parents' health care and long-term care without the guarantees of Medicare?

Mr. Speaker, how would their generation afford a pay-as-you-go system for their parents' generation when there are only two workers supporting every retiree? And finally they must ask themselves, will Medicare be there for me when it is my time to retire?

These are serious questions that demand serious answers. That is why I think we need to refine what we consider compassionate in this House. I would argue that it is compassionate for us to do a much better job of making tough decisions on spending in today's Congress to save programs not only for present generations, but for the future generations of Americans.

Quite frankly, to maintain current benefits after the baby-boomers retire would require crippling levels of taxation that would grind our economy to a halt and put all of our Federal programs at risk. In our effort to be compassionate today, we are spending tomorrow's money. At our present rate we are going to leave future generations with nothing but IOUs.

The best thing that we can do to save Medicare and Social Security for future generations is to reduce the growth of the programs and maintain the growing economy that allows us to sustain tax revenues and keep these important entitlements afloat.

The tax cuts of the past 6 years have served this purpose. I think the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Iowa have explained that very well. Last year the Federal Treasury took in more money than it ever has before, because our tax policies have allowed Americans to keep more of their money, and they have allowed U.S. businesses to flourish and expand despite the strain caused by the technology bubble, the tragedy of September 11, and the cost of the war on terror.

Mr. Speaker, the tax cuts boost the economy. In order to preserve the tax cuts, we have to reduce our spending. Certainly we have to cut back on earmarks and local projects, and I certainly hope we heed President Bush's call to cut the number of earmarks in half.

But that is not going to be enough. We must curtail the growth of entitlement spending, or else cuts elsewhere in the budget will never offset those exploding costs. We have to fund our national priorities, but we must be more selective in what we consider priorities.

□ 1745

We took an important step last year when we saved \$40 billion in the Deficit Reduction Act. That legislation required courageous leadership, and we are going to need more of that kind of leadership in the future.

So to sum it up, the tax cuts boost the economy. A strong economy fills Federal coffers, and tax revenues allow us to fund programs important to all Americans so long as we learn to live within our means.

I would like to thank the gentleman from California for leading this important discussion. In his time here in the House, he has proven to be a leader on these issues, and I appreciate his experience as a CPA, as a businessman, and one who has furnished jobs and helped this economy grow. I appreciate this time he has yielded me.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. I thank very much the gentleman from Georgia for his remarks, with which I can fully associate. But there are people who have been in Congress less time than I have, and one of them will be our next speaker here, Mr. DAVIS, the gentleman from Tennessee. I would like you to yield time to Mr. DAVIS from Tennessee, one of our freshmen.

Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee. Thank you, Mr. CAMPBELL. Thank you for your leadership and bringing this important debate.

And thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to rise. One of my favorite people in Washington all through history was President Ronald Reagan. Most of us know that the anniversary of his birth was just this week; 96 years ago President Reagan was born. And he once said, we don't have a \$1 trillion debt because we haven't taxed enough. We have a \$1 trillion debt because we spend too much. And I think that is important for this Congress to understand. I think that is a commonsense approach that the people of America can understand. It is about spending. It is not about taxing. We overspend, we don't overtax. I think that is very important.

As a matter of fact, if we continue on the pace that we have today, our revenues are outpacing us, and we continue to do that, we have our revenues outpace our spending over the next 5 years, President Bush's budget will be balanced by the year 2012, and we can do that without raising taxes. Now, to me, that is an exciting prospect to be able to balance the budget without raising taxes. And we do that at the same time maintaining the successful pro-business economic policies that we put in place. I think that is very important. And it is not just Republicans saying that. It is the Congressional Budget Office. It has actually given us data to support the data that we have in front of us. Just last week, the CBO supported the fact that tax cuts of 2003 helped boost the Federal revenues by 68 percent. Cut taxes, bring in more revenue, allow people across America and from the First District of Tennessee to keep more money in their pockets. As they do that, they spend it back in their districts. It circulates through the economy. It helps the Federal Government. You do it by keeping taxes low, not overtaxing. And we need to do that at the same time we keep fiscal restraint in place. Our economy has actually grown through 21 straight quarters. That is a good thing. We don't want to go back on that. We want to make sure that we stand strong, keep our tax cuts in place, keep our econ-

omy humming along and see that we could go from 21 straight quarters to 22 to 23 to 24.

In the period between 2004 and 2006, Federal tax revenues rose by the largest margin in 40 years. You do it by keeping taxes low, not by raising them.

Another exciting fact about our economy, the deficit has been cut in half 2 years ahead of schedule. And we did it by keeping taxes low. I think that is what the people of northeast Tennessee, good commonsense, hard-working people, want to have happen. Keep our taxes low. Let us keep the money in our district. Let us provide for our families. And as we do that, the economy will grow. As the economy grows, we take care of the Federal Government.

I think we need to look at government much like we look at a family sitting around a family table back in east Tennessee. People do have tight budgets. Unlike the Federal Government, though, people back in east Tennessee have to make tough decisions. When they have a tough budget, they can't say, well, I will just go out and raise my taxes and have somebody send me some more money so I can spend more. What they do in east Tennessee and across America is they have to make decisions about, well, I can't spend as much as I used to. And if we continue to do the right things, they will have that money back home.

The President, once again, in his budget is calling for making the 2001 and the 2003 tax relief provisions permanent. The administration projects total revenue growth to grow 5.4 percent per year if we keep those tax cuts in place.

Tax cuts are critical to maintaining our present healthy economy. We simply have a choice. We have a choice of a bigger economy or bigger government. That is the choice we have. And I certainly hope that my colleagues here on the House floor will understand how important it is to allow people back home to keep more of their money and keep government small and allow families to take care of themselves.

To reach the goal of a balanced budget, we need to hold the line on spending. We need to reduce earmarks. And I think we need to pass line item vetoes to crack down on worthless pork barrel spending. I don't think the Congress has done a good enough job on that.

I know there was a bill passed just last week and said there was no earmarks. Well, reading through the data, I am from east Tennessee, and I didn't realize we had a rainforest in Iowa. That is interesting for me to know. I didn't study that back in school in east Tennessee. Maybe someone else can explain that to me when they get up to speak. But that is an earmark that was in the resolution that passed last week.

We are being disingenuous with the American people. And the American people are smart. They will catch on to

what is going on. They will not be fooled.

Another thing that I heard before I came over, I was sitting in my office, and I heard the other side speaking. And they talked about the Medicare cuts and what we are doing to health care. The reality is, under President Bush's budget, Medicare will grow 5.6 percent. Now, back in east Tennessee, that is not a cut. That is a growth of 5.6 percent in Medicare. So please, do not be fooled. Do not be fooled. There is not a rainforest in Iowa, and Medicare is not being cut.

I think if people continue to use common sense, they will support the Congress. They want the Congress to do the right thing. It goes right back to what Ronald Reagan said. We don't have a \$1 trillion debt because we haven't taxed enough. We have a \$1 trillion debt because we spend too much. And I ask my colleagues to make sure we don't spend too much in this Congress. Thank you for allowing me to take part.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee. And, you know, we don't have a rainforest in Iowa right now. But if the budget passed by the Democrats in this House, when was it, last week, were to become law, then we will have a rainforest in Iowa, and it will be built with \$50 million of your money. That is you people watching. It will be tax money taken from you to pay to build a rainforest in Iowa.

Now, Democrats have only been in charge for a little longer than 30 days, and already they have made it easier to raise taxes. They raise taxes on domestic oil and gas producers. I mean, I totally don't get that when here we are trying to become less reliant on foreign oil, and we have gas prices where they are, and they are going to tax domestic oil and gas producers. And, of course, when they tax them, they spend the money on an entirely new program, and then on top of that then they pass this budget which allows this rainforest in Iowa to go through and spends another \$10 billion, which increases the deficit not reduces it.

But I don't need to explain any of this to our next speaker, the gentelady from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN). I would like to yield to the gentelady from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, how pleased I am to join the gentleman from California and my Republican Study Committee colleagues in this special order hour. As we talk about the budget and we really begin to focus on some of the components in this budget, you know, I think that many of my Republican Study Committee colleagues are interested in digging into this document, and their constituents are well served by that, like the gentleman from Tennessee talking about his First District constituents who are logging on to his Web site, who are looking at this budget. And certainly we want to direct people to the Repub-

lican Study Committee Web site. Here it is: RSC@mail.house.gov. We will be happy to point out some of the fallacies.

Our colleagues across the aisle like to talk about fiscal responsibility, but then they don't practice it. They don't practice what they preach. And we have appropriately dubbed the work that the Democrats are doing as the "Hold on to your wallet Congress" because they are definitely coming to a pocket near you. And they want more of your money. That is one thing that you can basically take that IOU to the bank. They are going to try to cash it in. It is in the form of your hardearned dollars. So RSC@mail.house.gov. We invite everybody to work with us through this process. We want to be certain that we have your ideas. And we know, as the gentleman from Tennessee was saying, as Ronald Reagan, so many times has said, government doesn't have a revenue problem. It has a spending problem. Government never gets enough of your money. You know, one of the things that I have repeatedly done in my town hall meetings is to say, how much is enough? How much is enough for government to tax? What is the ceiling? When are they going to say, we have got it, we are flush with money? We all know that, and I will yield to the gentleman for comment.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. As you say, one of the great differences between us and them, we talked about it being your money, their money, the People's money, the taxpayers' money. Your money, watching on television, they talk about it like it is their money, like it is the government's money.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. If the gentleman will yield, that is an excellent point, because every dollar we spend is not ours. It is not the government's. It is the taxpayers'. And this is a government of, by and for the people. It is not a government of the government.

And our friends across the aisle, through the New Deal, through the great society, putting all of these programs that sound good, that really answered a lot of questions and needs, you know, they put these in place, and then it grows and grows and grows. And then you have a big, big bureaucracy, and the bureaucracy becomes unresponsive. And the constituents want accountability with that.

I had at one point said, you know, it reminded me very much of The Little Shop of Horrors, that stage play that we have all seen. And the plant grows and grows and grows, and then finally it says, feed me more, Seymour, and it envelops everything because that is what the government is saying to the American taxpayer, feed me more.

We have an expert who is with us on so many of our family budget matters, our Republican Study Committee, RSC, chairman, Mr. HENSARLING of Texas, and I will yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HENSARLING. Well, I thank the gentelady for yielding, and I want to

thank her for all the great communications work that she does for the conservative caucus in Congress, the Republican Study Committee. Thank the gentleman from California, our Budget and Spending Task Force chairman for the excellent work he does in helping bring this debate to the American people. And you know, the gentelady is so right. This debate really reduces down to a very fundamental issue. Do you want more government and less opportunity, or do you want more opportunity and less government?

People in this institution need to remember that every time they vote for more money for some government program, they are taking money away from some family program.

In many respects, Mr. Speaker, this isn't a debate about how much we are going to spend on health care or how much we are going to spend on education. It is a debate about who is going to do the spending. Republicans want families to do the spending. We want small businesses to do the spending. And yet, our friends on the other side of the aisle, the Democrats, they want government to do more of the spending.

Now, as I am fond of saying, people are entitled to their own opinions, but they are not entitled to their own facts. As a member of the Budget Committee, I just came from a hearing earlier this morning on our annual budget that was quite instructive. We heard accusations of massive tax cuts.

Well, it is kind of interesting, because when you look at the record, when we have provided tax relief to the American people, guess what? We have ended up with more tax revenue. We have the greatest amount of tax revenue that we have ever had in the history of the United States of America. And in 2004, after the pro-growth tax relief, tax receipts were up 5.5 percent. Well, how did that add to the deficit, Mr. Speaker?

In 2005, tax receipts were up 14.5 percent. Well, how did that add to the deficit? In 2006, 11.8 percent. And now in the first quarter of the first quarter of 2007, they are up approximately 7.2 percent.

Now I am not here to tell you that every time you engage in tax relief, you get more tax revenues, but, guess what? Facts don't lie.

You are entitled to your opinion. You are not entitled to your own facts. When you allow small businesses and American families to keep more of what they earn so that they can save and invest and create more jobs, guess what? They go out and do it. So that is myth number one that somehow by allowing American people to keep more of what they have earned, that somehow that is adding to the deficit.

□ 1800

The deficit has dropped. The American people are not overtaxed. Government spends too much.

Now, we have another myth in the debate that I heard in the Budget Committee this morning, and that is talk

about all the massive budget cuts. Well, Mr. Speaker, people have to be very careful. I took the liberty of looking up the word "cut" in Webster's dictionary. It means to reduce. Ninety percent of the time somebody in Washington talks about cutting a budget, what they mean is that the budget isn't growing quite as fast as I want it to grow, and so, therefore, that is a cut. I mean, that is like somebody's child coming up to him and saying, Dad, I would like an extra dollar a week in allowance. And you say, Well, you know what? Maybe you deserve an increase in your allowance, Daughter. I will give you 75 cents. And they say, Gee, Dad, that is a 25 percent cut. I wanted a dollar extra a week, and you are only giving me 75 cents. Well, the point is you are getting 75 cents more.

So we are going to hear the usual misleading rhetoric about all these budget cuts. But guess what? Since President Bush came into office, and I know we will hear about this one, total antipoverty spending is up 41 percent, one of the most dramatic increases in the history of America. That is assuming that you think that somehow government is ultimately going to solve this problem. And if you look at almost every major budget area and don't just look at what has happened under the Bush administration, as long as Republicans have been in control of Congress, look for the last 10 years, you can see energy up almost 200 percent; education spending, elementary and secondary education, 100 percent. So, again, you are entitled to your own opinions, but you are not entitled to your own facts. That simply does not equate into a cut.

So we will have increased debates as we go through and talk about this budget. But what is most exciting is that because of the economic progrowth tax relief provided by a Republican Congress, we have over 7 million people who now have paychecks who used to not have paychecks. We have one of the highest levels of homeownership in the history of America. We have the highest stock market we have had in a long time. And these people want to raise taxes on the American people.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENSARLING. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate those latter points. And it gets to the question of people who hear our discussions of why is this all important to me? Over the last several days, as we have begun to look at the President's budget as he submitted it to Congress, we have heard from the experts, we have heard the debates, we have heard the speeches, we have heard talk of the CBO, the OMB, dynamic scoring, static scoring, a whole list of other acronyms and technicalities and the like. But you have to really at some point in time step back from all the Byzantine make-

up that Congress is when it comes to a budget and say is there some sort of common principle that we can base all this on that underpins this almost \$3 trillion endeavor that we are all engaged in?

For all the complexities of this process, the fact of the matter is that what we are doing is nothing different than what every family in America has to do every day of their lives. They have to look at the amount of money that they expect to have and get over the next 12 months and decide what are their priorities, where are they going to spend it, how are they going to spend it. Now, there are some differences, of course. I guess there are three of them between what we are doing and what the average family budget is. First of all, it is on the scale. We are doing things here on a mammoth scale compared to the average homeowner.

Years ago there used to be a \$1,000 bill. I don't think there is a \$1,000 bill anymore. I think they did away with that. But if you took a \$1,000 bill and you stacked them up, you would need 1,000 of those \$1,000 bills just to get up to \$1 billion; and then if you had that stack of \$1,000 bills, you would need 1,000 of those stacks to get up to \$1 trillion. And we are looking at a \$3 trillion budget. So we are looking here at a size that is different.

Also, families realize that their family budget has a finite amount of money that they deal with, whereas we look at it slightly differently because we know we can always borrow and spend and print more money.

And, finally, one other major difference in what we do here than the family budget is that we are spending other people's money. So many times people come down to the floor and say we have to be compassionate for this program or that, but we have to realize at the end of the day it is not our money we are taking out of the pocket. It is the American taxpayers' dollars that are coming out of the pocket to pay for these programs. So that is where the difference is.

But at the end of the day, it is all the same in the sense that we have to live within the boundaries, just like a family should. At least that is what the American taxpayer is looking at and asking us why we don't. Why don't we live within a confined budget like they do? And why don't we go one step further, as many families do? Just as many families save for their children's education for the future, why can't we get to the point of actually having a balanced budget where we can set aside some dollars for the future generations?

Now, I, like my colleague from Texas who just spoke, also serve on the Budget Committee. And I have to be honest with you that what we have heard there from the other side of the aisle is that they are laying the groundwork, from their comments at least, to do two things, to attack the budget on the point of taxing and spending. They are

laying this groundwork on spending saying that we are not spending enough and on the side of the taxes that we are not taxing enough.

And on that latter point I will just close on this point. The budget cuts that this Congress, Republican Congress, has done in the past have been progressive budget cuts. That means it helps the average-income family more than anybody else. And I get the static information not from the CBO or these other experts. I get this information from nobody else but the New York Times. And they have looked at the budget cuts that we have done, and they proved the point for us; that if you are making less than \$50,000, that you saw the percent change in your average tax bill by a 48 percent reduction. So the lowest incomes under the progressive tax cuts help the lowest-income people the most. If you are making between \$50,000 and \$100,000, a 21 percent reduction; \$100,000 to \$200,000, a 17 percent reduction; \$200,000 to \$500,000, it flows into a 10 percent reduction. So you see the trend.

What we have done in the past is help the average taxpayer in the State of New Jersey around \$200,000. What we must do now is make those tax cuts permanent and do as a family budget, live within our means.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey. Wow, what a shock. The other side says they are tax cuts for the rich, and they are not, unless making under \$50,000 makes you rich.

Now if we can go to the other side of the country, I yield to a great defender of taxpayers and taxpayers' rights, Mr. JEFF FLAKE, the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and putting together this Special Order. And I just have a minute, but I would like to submit a statement for the RECORD and to point out how important it is.

I am glad so many are making the distinction between tax relief and spending, overall government spending. You simply can't assume that spending money on a teapot museum ought to be treated the same as leaving money in people's pockets. You simply can't equate them the same. You can't score them the same. Whenever we have tax relief, we have increased revenue. As the gentleman from Texas correctly pointed out, those are the facts, and it has happened again and again and again.

So I am glad that so many are saying that tonight, and, again, I will submit a statement for the RECORD.

I applaud the President's commitment to balancing the budget by 2012 without raising taxes. I also support the attention given to cutting entitlement growth. Mandatory entitlement spending eats up 50 percent of the almost \$3 trillion budget and is growing at an alarming rate.

However, I am concerned that Members will erode these savings by proposing to increase entitlement programs and, in order to adhere

to the new PAYGO rules, claim that the increases will be offset by eliminating some of the important tax relief Congress has passed over the last 5 years.

This rationale assumes that a tax cut is simply a straight-out loss of revenue for the Federal Government. This is why it is extremely important to consider how tax cuts have actually affected revenues over the last couple of years.

For example, the Joint Committee on Taxation estimated that the cost of the 2003 and 2004 tax cuts would equal \$296 billion in lost revenues for fiscal years 2003 to 2005.

However, tax revenues actually finished fiscal year 2005 at \$124 billion above the adjusted baseline, meaning that 42 percent of the projected revenue loss had been recouped. That number still continues to grow each year.

It is irresponsible to assume that by eliminating tax relief the government will see an increase in revenues. I believe the opposite is true.

We must take into account the increased capital that tax relief produces, which translates into more investments and savings, more jobs, and, ultimately, more income tax revenues.

This is why I will soon reintroduce my bill to require the CBO and Joint Committee on Taxation to include dynamic scores in their analysis of all revenue bills, and encourage my colleagues to cosponsor it.

We cannot continue to make policy decisions based on predictions that simply do not take into consideration fundamental economic principles that have been proven time and again.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona.

And now from the great desert Southwest to the South, I yield to Dr. GINGREY, the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

And I want to take just a second to join my colleagues from Georgia and particularly the two that are on the floor tonight, Dr. PRICE and Representative WESTMORELAND, in saying to our colleague CHARLIE NORWOOD that we are praying for you, buddy. All of us from Georgia, but every Member of this body on both sides of the aisle are praying that the miracle of God's healing will deliver you back to us soon, and we think about you constantly.

Mr. Speaker, this hour is a great opportunity for us to discuss the budget. And I had an opportunity this morning to be on the C-SPAN program, and the host said to me, Congressman, are you aware of the fact that one of the Members of the other body has recommended that maybe we need something called a war tax to pay for our Operations Iraqi and Enduring Freedom? And I said to the host, I know that has probably been done in the history of this country. Maybe it was necessary to fund a previous war. But the thing about this President and this administration is because of these economic principles of cutting taxes and growing revenue, fortunately, Mr.

Speaker, we have been able to do this without raising the people's taxes. And I certainly commend President Bush for that foresight and wisdom and the former majority party as we supported those tax cuts when it was predicted that it would cost the economy over a 10-year period something like \$1.3 trillion.

So what I would like to say to my friends on the other side of the aisle in particular as I wrap up quickly, and I know time is limited, on the defense budget, please, please do not cut future combat systems. Don't cut our missile defense system to pay for some social programs when the defense of this Nation is so important at this time of war.

With that, I really appreciate my colleague giving me the opportunity to weigh in tonight.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia. And I would just like to say to everyone who is watching and listening, you have been listening for the last hour to members of the Republican Study Committee. You will be hearing a lot from us because we want to watch out for your money and your interests, not the government and the government's interests.

To close things I would like to yield to another new Member of Congress, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

I just want to follow up on the gentleman from Georgia's comments. He is exactly right about the defense portion of this budget. It is critical at this time with the terror threat that we face that we do what is right by the defense budget. In 1945, 38 percent of gross domestic product was spent on the defense. Today it is 3.8 percent at a time, as I said earlier, where we have terrorists around the world who want to do our families and our country harm.

Normally when we talk about budgets, and folks have pointed this out, we get focused on the numbers, on the data, on the policy, and I think all too often we forget about the people, the families out there who are impacted by our decision. And I am hopeful over the next few weeks that we really focus on the impact our decisions are going to have on families and taxpayers and business owners.

I am reminded of a story of a constituent of ours a few years ago who wanted to meet with our U.S. Senator. And our constituent is a successful businessman in the manufacturing sector, and we were discussing the whole issue of trade and competing with China and India. And we sat down with our United States Senator, and our constituent took the piece that they make, and he had taped to that piece two pennies, and he took that manufactured piece of steel and he slid it across the table to our Senator, and he said, Senator, those two pennies, those

2 cents, represent our labor costs in that piece. He said, we can compete with anybody on labor. We are so efficient, our processes, our systems. What we do in our business, we are so good at it, we can compete with anybody. He says, what makes it tough for us to compete is the things you guys do, and he pointed right to our Senator.

It is the things the politicians do. It is the high taxes. It is the high regulation. It is the ridiculous spending we have heard others talk about here over the last hour. Those are the things that make it tough on the families and taxpayers of this great country to compete; to start their business; to go after their goals, their dreams; to pursue those things that have meaning and significance to them as a family.

And I am hopeful, as we proceed on this debate over the next weeks, several months, that we will remember the business owners and the families out there who are making it and doing the things that make this country the greatest Nation in the world.

I appreciate the time we have had here. I appreciate the gentleman from California and this opportunity to share with the American people.

#### HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HILL). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, this evening I am joined by some of my colleagues who are new Members, and we are going to talk about the President's health care proposals and also what he articulated both in his State of the Union Address, and more recently last Monday when he gave us his budget message.

And my concern, as always, is that President Bush has prioritized, or says he wants to prioritize, health care as an issue and particularly deal with the problem of the uninsured. And we certainly recognize that under his watch as President for the last 6 or 7 years that the problem of the uninsured has grown greater in this country. There are more uninsured than ever. But at the same time the proposals that the President puts forward, in particular the amount of money that has been allocated in his budget for some of these health care needs, does not go along, essentially, with the rhetoric that he has been using, saying that he wants to cover the uninsured and prioritize the concerns of the uninsured.

And, again, I always say my effort is not to chastise the President. I appreciate the fact that President Bush is prioritizing health care and talking about it, because he has the bully pulpit, and to the extent that he is out there talking about health care, it gives us an opportunity in the Congress to address the issue.

□ 1815

But it is unfortunate that the proposals in the budget that he proposes

do not really go along with any kind of concerted effort that would be meaningful to address those health care concerns, and particularly the problems of the uninsured.

Before I begin, I wanted to yield to my colleague from Colorado. I know he and I were both watching the debate by our Republican colleagues in the last hour. I know he would like to address some of those concerns.

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, Congressman PALLONE.

We did have a chance to hear our friends from the Republican side of the aisle. They talked about how they could manage the budget, how this President's budget was great and good for America. But last November, the people of this country cut through the smoke and mirrors of the Republican budgets, and they asked for and voted for a change in direction of this country.

Let's just start with where this Republican President and the Republican Congress left off last fall when we had the elections. Under George Bush, under this presidency, we have had another \$3.9 trillion added to the debt of this country. The debt on each one of us now is about \$29,000 per person and rising every day under this White House and the Republican Congress. There was nowhere near a balanced budget at any time over the last few years, just continuing to dig us deeper and deeper into debt.

The people of this country saw it. They didn't want anymore of that, because they understand that, right now, because of that debt that has been incurred over the last few years, the interest that we pay on our debt now dwarfs what we spend on education, veterans' benefits and homeland security, to just name a few, because we are spending so much, because we borrowed so much. The President and White House has proposed a budget where we continue to borrow and spend and drive our country farther and farther into debt.

They talked about how they could manage the budget so much better. My friends here know they didn't even finish the budget. We had to take a mess that was left over by the Republican Congress and really the White House where they didn't finish their business. We had to deal with it last week to try to get our budget in order.

The Democratic Congress really is changing the way business is being done here in our Nation's Capital because we are addressing budget problems. And we are going to show that we really do believe in making health care a priority and not just giving lip service to it.

So I would like to yield back to Mr. PALLONE or to our friend, Representative CASTOR, for their comments, and then I would like to talk about how the President's health care budget affects the people in Colorado, my fair State.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comments. This does directly relate to the health care debate, because if you are in a State where your deficit continues to climb, as we face now under the years of the Republican majority, it is very difficult to address any unmet needs, whether it be health care or whatever, because of the deficit and the constant having to pay back on the debt.

I wanted to say something about what you mentioned in response to our Republican colleagues. I have been here a long time, almost 20 years now, I am in my 19th year. When I first started in 1988, the Democrats were in the majority.

There were a group of Republicans who used to come down every night doing special orders, just like we are, and they would have the pages bring this huge digital clock that literally was the whole length of the well, from this chart over to where my colleague from Colorado is, and there would be two or three pages that would bring this big digital clock down. They would go on and rail about the deficit and the deficit was going up so much a day. This literally went on for like 6 years while I was down here, from when I first started in 1988 until 1994.

In 1994, the Republicans took the majority under Newt Gingrich. The digital clock disappeared, and all we heard were constant spending and going deeper into debt, and nobody in the Republican Party ever mentioned the deficit again as it continued to climb in those years, and particularly now under President Bush. For the life of me, I don't understand where this whole traditional Republican philosophy, which was to care how you spent the money and you didn't want to go into debt, just disappeared from their ideology.

In fact, I have to say, in the last campaign, because you mentioned it, President Clinton was actually at an event that I attended in New Jersey, and I am not sure I can repeat exactly what he said. But essentially he said that he watched the Republican party under their congressional majority in the 12 years or so that they were in the majority go from this party of principles that was worried about not getting involved in wars that were not in the interest of the United States, worrying about the debt and spending money, to a party that just abandoned all these ideals.

He actually said, right now, the Democrats cover both the left and right ideologically, because we are still concerned about the problems of the average person in that we want to cover people who don't have health insurance. We want to make sure people can afford to send their kids to college. But at the same time, we have covered the area where we don't want to get involved in foreign wars or foreign entanglements that are not in our interest. And, most importantly, we are the ones most worried about the debt and trying to make sure we are not spending a lot of money.

Now, all of a sudden, we are in the majority, and they are starting to talk about the deficit that they have grown so much in the last 12 years. It is unbelievable.

When you talk about the health care debate, this goes to the heart of it, because the bottom line is, if you want to expand and deal with the problem of the uninsured, some of them are people that are not going to be able to afford to buy their own health insurance. If you don't have any money because you just keep racking up this huge debt, you are not going to be able to cover the people. So it directly relates.

I just wanted to give these statistics about where we have been in the last few years. If you look at this, the point I have been trying to make is under the President's watch for the last 6 or 7 years, not only have the number of uninsured gone up, but the cost of health care and health insurance keeps rising. Therefore, it has just become unaffordable for a lot of Americans.

This chart says that workers are now paying an average of \$1,094 more in annual health care premiums for their families than they did in the year 2000. You can see the problem with the affordability of health care.

Then the next chart has the number of uninsured in 2001, 41.2 million, and the number of uninsured in 2006, 47 million. One million more Americans become uninsured each year under the President's watch.

The chart over there, I will leave to the gentleman to explain.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Our chart in this instance shows the number of uninsured now exceeds the cumulative population of 24 States plus the District of Columbia, so all of those States that are in red and the District of Columbia, we have more people who don't have insurance. Under the budgets that have been proposed by the President and have been passed or just sort of glossed over by the prior Congresses, we have seen an assist to the wealthiest people in this country, while at the same time the people in the middle, the hard-working people of this country, have found themselves finding it harder and harder to make ends meet and have health insurance for themselves and their families.

Mr. PALLONE. Just briefly, I want to yield to the gentlewoman, and I have my colleague from the Virgin Islands here, too. The problem with what the President has proposed, both in the State of the Union and the budget message on Monday, there are really two major ways to cover more of these uninsured. One is, you do something with the employer-based system, which is traditionally the way most people get their insurance, on the job, so it is easier for employers to provide health insurance and for their employees to contribute to it.

The other, of course, is to build on existing Federal programs, whether it be Medicaid or Medicare or SCHIP, the program for kids, to expand eligibility



and make it so more people can sign up for them.

The problem that I wanted to point out tonight, and we will get into it more, is that between the State of the Union address and the budget message, what the President has proposed totally really does nothing to affect either of those areas. He is basically talking about taxing employer-sponsored benefits, group plans, if they are a good plan, and sending people into the individual market with some kind of a tax break. Generally speaking, that is not very helpful because it is going to penalize the people who have a good employer-sponsored plan and at the same time push people into the individual market where they probably cannot afford to buy a good policy. Then with the budget message on Monday, we got all these cuts in Medicaid, SCHIP, the government programs that we would like to see expanded to cover more of the uninsured.

So, between the two, he is addressing the problem but coming with proposals that, in my opinion, actually make it worse.

I yield now to the gentlewoman from Florida. I am glad she is with us tonight.

Ms. CASTOR. I thank my colleague from New Jersey, who has been such a leader for the American people for access to better health care. He is absolutely right, that the President's actions don't match his words. I have also been combing through the Presidential budget proposal. One of my hometown newspapers said that the Presidential budget should begin with these words: "Once upon a time," as in a fairy tale. I am a mom with two young daughters at home. We do a lot of reading at night and try to get the homework done. We will do reading of fairy tales. This, what the White House has sent over, is a political fairy tale. Unfortunately, it is going to hurt a lot of folks. It is going to hurt a lot of our constituents back home. I thought we could explain that a little bit.

Oftentimes we talk in such technical terms in government. When we talk of Medicaid and people say Medicaid, sometimes they get Medicaid and Medicare mixed up.

Medicaid, these are pregnant women, infants, children in families earning about \$25,000 a year, foster kids, medically needy adults, a lot of our senior citizens in nursing homes. So when you hear there are Medicaid cuts, I would like us to really put a face on that and say they are going after the most vulnerable in this country, infants, poor kids, foster kids and seniors in nursing homes.

Also the budget sent over from the White House will hurt our seniors. The White House proposes to cut Medicare. Now, I am from Florida, and a lot of folks retire down to Florida. They have worked hard all their lives, and this is really one of the only benefits that we can give them, in addition to Social Security. So what the White House

budget is proposing to do is ask them to pay even more. They are asking our hardworking doctors to take a cut as well.

What that does in my community in Tampa Bay is it discourages the best doctors from participating in Medicare. You see, I want my seniors to have the best medical care. I want them to see the best doctors, and I want those good doctors to stay in the Medicare system.

This would also hurt our children, our kids back home. My colleague from New Jersey knows this very well, that under the State Children's Health Insurance Program, we have a lot of needs. The States, our local communities, the Feds, we have been doing a pretty good job. But, do you know what? We can do a whole lot better. We must do a lot better.

So it was very disappointing to receive this budget from the White House that says: Do you know what? Even though we are making such progress, and we have such tremendous needs in this country for children to be able to go in and see a doctor, get their immunizations, get some advice on how to take care of themselves, they say we are not going to do that.

Their priorities are out of whack. Instead, I think it is a blatant political statement that we are going to continue these tax cuts for the wealthiest among us, and we are going to sock it to the most vulnerable, our seniors and our kids.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman's remarks. You brought it home. It is hard sometimes to talk about the budget. The budget at the Federal level is a very complex thing. But we have to give an explanation, I think, about what the President's proposal is doing, which is really the opposite. It is not going to make it easier to cover the uninsured, it is going to make it more difficult.

I now yield to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands, who is a physician and who has been very active in the whole health care issue for a number of years here in the Congress, particularly on the whole health care disparities issue, which is another thing that we haven't really talked about so much in this Congress, but has to be addressed.

□ 1830

I thank my colleague for yielding, and I want to thank Congressman PALLONE for his leadership on health care for a number of years. And we are really happy that you are going to be chairing the Health Subcommittee, and we look forward to addressing all these issues with you.

But certainly, as you were saying, as we look at how we can expand access to health care and bring more Americans under coverage, we can't start by cutting what has been the backbone of health care, Medicare and Medicaid, SCHIP. Those need to be really strengthened.

As we look at the President's budget, which is very disappointing and one

fairy tale that is not going to end, "and they lived happily ever after," because the cuts that we are seeing are leaving our seniors, our disabled, and our children and pregnant women who are about to bring children into the world without the access to the kind of health care that they need.

Beyond that, as we look at health disparities for people of color, African Americans, Latino Americans, Native Americans, Asian Pacific Islanders, there is nothing in the budget that addresses the gaps in health care for these populations. And certainly, if we are ever going to reduce the skyrocketing cost of health care, we need to focus on prevention and comprehensive systems of care that help people to stay healthy. And we also have to look at the social determinants of health care. You can't live in rundown housing and polluted neighborhoods and be healthy. So we have a lot of things to address.

And going beyond the cuts that you have already talked about in Medicare and Medicaid and SCHIP, there are so many other areas that are being cut as well that further undermines what we need to do to provide good quality comprehensive health care for people in this country. Some of them, funding for training: In the President's budget, again, nursing training is cut \$88 million; the National Health Service Corps is cut; health profession training programs that bring some of the underrepresented minorities to serve our increasingly diverse population are cut \$135 million, and it has already been cut in 2006; \$143 million for children's vaccines is cut, vaccines, one of the bulwarks of prevention in this country; mental health programs cut \$159 million; rural health cut \$143 million.

So instead of helping, and you rightly point out that the proposal, the only proposal that we have heard with respect to health care in this country, the President's proposal and tax credits does more to harm the system than help the system. And then, in addition to that, undermining the safety net of Medicaid, Medicare, and SCHIP, as well as cutting some of the programs that provide the services that would be there to keep people healthy.

So this budget is a terrible budget. I know that we are under very, very tight fiscal constraints with huge unprecedented deficits, huge debts, but somehow the people are counting on us to improve health care in this country. And improving health care in this country really improves productivity. It keeps our country strong, and it is a matter of national security. And the health of our people is the health of our Nation, and we have to find a way to restore these cuts in the budget and close the gaps in health care, expand access to more Americans; and in doing so, we really will be helping our country.

Mr. PALLONE. I appreciate the gentlewoman's comments, and I know how much you have worked on this issue

and, in particular, the disparities issues. I could go on, too, with some of these things. We have worked a lot on health care for American Indians and the Indian Health Service. Now, there is a slight increase for the Indian Health Service, but he took out the whole urban Indian issue. And we find a lot of American Indians now gravitating toward urban areas, and he just cut out the whole program for them.

I want to yield to some of the other Members. But if we could just, because it is hard to explain this whole thing with the President's tax initiatives, but I think we should spend a little time on it. In his State of the Union Address, what he basically said is that, for the people who are in employer-sponsored health insurance, which still most Americans get their health insurance that way, a lot of them either through their union or individually with their employers have bargained, if you will, to have a very good health care package that is comprehensive; and what basically he is saying is, if it is too good, I will call it the Cadillac proposal, then we are going to tax you because you don't need such great health coverage. And then, at the same time, whatever money we are going to save on that, we are going to use by giving a tax break for those who go and try to buy insurance through the individual market. But the problem with that is, you know, the individual market is very volatile, very insecure, no guarantee that you can even buy a policy. So most of these people that are uninsured are not in a position to buy a policy in the individual market. So even if they get a break, it is probably not going to mean that much to them that they would actually be able to buy a good policy. So why would you sacrifice people who have a good policy and tax them to pay for people to go into the individual market, which is one that you may not be able to even get into anyway because it is expensive or there are all kinds of problems with eligibility. So that is the biggest concern. I don't know if anybody wants to talk about that, but that is why I think his proposal for employer sponsored care just makes no sense. If anybody wants to address that, otherwise, I will yield to you, and you talk about whatever you would like. The gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KAGEN. I thank you for yielding and thank you for putting on this opportunity, making it possible for some of us to express not just our views but the views of the people back home that we represent.

Mr. PALLONE. I should mention that you are a physician as well.

Mr. KAGEN. But I don't want you to hold it against me. And I won't hold it against Mrs. CHRISTENSEN that you have "M.D." behind your name.

But if you ask around the Chamber and ask around back home, everyone that I know understands that how you spend your money and where you spend your money is a reflection of your val-

ues. And the current administration has shown us where their values are, and they are not with people. They are not really helping us to provide care to millions of people, 48 million, who don't have access to affordable health care, in this country.

His State of the Union was very uplifting. He should be commended for bringing up the subject of providing access to health care for everyone. But his policy, as we talked about last week, raises taxes and offers no hope of lowering the cost of health care for insurance costs or prescription drug costs. And, more recently, with his 2,500 page budget, which I haven't finished all the fine print yet, he has shown us his values once again.

The first thing he did was to cut benefits to veterans and make it much more difficult for veterans to get the well-deserved benefits that they have earned and that they deserve.

What did he do? He is asking for \$3.4 billion to come from veterans who have already earned their benefits, but now they have to kick it in. They are going to have to pay for their benefits that they have already earned. There are increasing copayments for veterans in their budget. I don't know where he is coming from on this, but he can't be coming from Wisconsin.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. My friend from Wisconsin is so right on this subject. It really is, where are your values? They are reflected in a budget. Now, as I said earlier, they didn't pass a budget last year. But last week, we passed a budget, and we wanted to show this country how much veterans mean to this country. And instead of cutting benefits, we raise benefits for our veterans.

We are changing the direction of this Nation because we know what the values of this Nation are, and they aren't reflected in the President's budget. They weren't reflected by the Republican's failure to deal with a budget last year. But they were reflected in what we did last week in taking a budget that hadn't been dealt with by the prior Congress and showing the world, showing this country, showing your State, my district, that we care about our veterans. And in this budget that the President has given to us for next year, again, this President has cut veterans benefits and medical benefits over the next 5 years.

I would like to yield back to my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. PALLONE. If you could just yield to me for a second. I really appreciate you bringing this up because I think it is so much on point. And I know there is a lot of confusion.

We have a fiscal year that goes from October to October. Last year, when the Republicans were in the majority, they didn't deal with the budget at all. They literally left at the end of the session in their lame duck in December and said, we can't pass the budget, we can't deal with the appropriations, so we are going to go home, and we will leave it to the next Congress. So lit-

erally last week, we had to adopt the budget of the appropriations of the previous year that had already began October 1st, and it was level funding. In other words, it was basically a continuing resolution that didn't add any money and used the previous year's budget as a baseline. And even with that, we were able to increase money for veterans' health, for Ryan White, which deals with HIV, for global AIDS, for the National Institutes of Health. The emphasis and the priority was on trying to provide more money for health care even as we were cutting other things, and we did that.

The reality is that President Bush's budget that we got this week, which is for next year, because the last year's budget has not been passed in the Senate and gone to his desk yet, didn't even take into consideration, and in many of the cases, those health care items that he put in this budget are less than what we adopted in that continuing resolution.

So here we are trying to make everything right, and we are not getting any help either from the Republicans last year when they were in the majority or now from the President and the Republicans on the other side. And for them to even come down here tonight and talk about the budget or the deficit is absurd given their record.

I yield back.

Mr. KAGEN. Thank you very much, Congressman PALLONE. And what Congressman PERLMUTTER says is true. Really, let's ask the right question. A lot of times in your career, being an attorney, you have to ask the right question to get the truth out of somebody. So what kind of Nation are we, and in which direction shall we move? Are we a Nation that values and treasures those who have served in harm's way in our military? I think we are. Are we a Nation that values the health and education of our children and the mothers that care for them? I think that we are. And that is really where Democrats differ from our opposition party. I really believe that our core values resonate with everyone, not just in Wisconsin where I come from but everywhere, in Florida as well.

I yield to Congresswoman CASTOR.

Ms. CASTOR. We talked earlier about how the White House budget proposal we received this week is a fairy tale, but its impact on our veterans really is a nightmare. The State of Florida where I am from, we have the second highest number of veterans in the country, and in my district, I have the busiest VA center in the country, the James Haley Center, which saw over 1.5 million vets last year. That is more than the population of the State of Kansas we saw at the Haley Center in Tampa.

The Haley Center is specialized for current Iraq war vets injured, coming back, that are suffering the IED blasts, spinal cord injuries, brain injuries. And in Florida, out of all the VA medical centers, Haley, the busiest, we have

gone now over the past 10 years from 2 million visits to over 5 million visits. And how can we say this is a reflection of values? How can we say we are going to step back from that responsibility? How can the White House send us a budget that steps back, at a time where they are escalating the war in Iraq, they are going to deescalate the commitment to our veterans? I don't think so.

In this Democratic Congress, we are going to take a new direction. There is new leadership in Washington, DC. And I am proud to be joined by some of the new Members, my colleagues, tonight, and also join with the efforts of leaders like my colleague from New Jersey. And I yield back.

Mr. PALLONE. I appreciate your comments. And I really think it is important that we keep stressing how we want to prioritize these health care needs, and there are so many, whether it is veterans or children or whatever it is.

I just want to give you a couple statistics. And I know it gets so bureaucratic to say, what is he doing up here with these statistics?

□ 1845

When we talk about the uninsured, the biggest groups still are the kids, and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands knows how much over the years what this SCHIP or kid care program, that we have tried to prioritize that, send the money back to the States, use their help to try to insure a lot of these kids.

I just use my State, but you could use any State. In my State right now for this SCHIP or kid care program, we have more kids that are eligible, meaning that they could theoretically sign up, or their parents could sign up, for this program than are currently enrolled, even though the program has been around for a while, and that is true in almost every State.

What we were hoping was that the President, in saying he wanted to deal with the uninsured, and knowing that the biggest group of uninsured is children, believe it or not, that he would simply provide funding to at least enroll those kids that are not enrolled who are currently eligible for the program. I am not even talking about expanding eligibility to kids who would not be eligible right now.

We got some statistics because we had a hearing with the Secretary of Health and Human Services earlier this week, and the number of children, if you want to just enroll those who are currently eligible, we figure it would take about \$12- to \$14 billion over 5 years to keep up with medical inflation to prevent current enrolled children from losing their coverage. I am talking about the ones that are now in the SCHIP program, \$12- to \$14 billion over 5 years just to make sure that they are still funded, those that are in it, and then at least another \$35- to \$45 billion over 5 years to reach eligible but unin-

sured children. These are the ones that could enroll, but they just have not for some reason. Their parents do not know about the program, the application is difficult, who knows.

So you are talking about what, maybe \$60 billion over the next 5 years if you want to keep, to keep those that are in the program and expand it to those who are eligible, and we are not even talking about expanding eligibility.

He comes in, the President, in his budget with \$5 billion. That would not even allow us to keep up with the kids that are currently in the program. These are not kids that are really poor and the parents are not working. These are working parents. I think the eligibility is up to like \$38,000 for a family of four. They are working, but they cannot get health insurance on the job. We went into that before, and so they try to tap into this Federal program.

Well, the Secretary said, well, we think \$5 billion is enough, and if it is not, well, then the States will have to take care of it. You know, the States are not in a position, I mean, they already have a hard enough time coming up with the money under the current match without having to go beyond that. So I just use that as an example.

The SCHIP, the kids health care program, is for those kids whose parents are working and who are making a little more money and are not eligible for Medicaid, which is for kids that are actually at the poverty level, like less than \$20,000 for a family of four.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Would the gentleman yield? I think the gentlewoman from Virgin Islands has something to say on this, too, but a couple of things.

In Colorado, on the point you are talking about, the SCHIP for kids, we have 176,000 kids who are at risk in this instance, and based on the President's budget, we cannot keep up with them. We cannot continue to provide them with the care that they deserve.

And as some of you know, I have a daughter with a chronic illness, and luckily, through my law firm, we had a good insurance program for all the trips to the emergency room and the different things like that. So we see on the one hand poorer kids, uninsured kids that are at risk, they are not going to be served, and under this President's budget, as you were saying, those of us who were fortunate enough to have a good insurance policy for kids with chronic illnesses or whatever might affect us, we are going to be taxed on this.

The President has said this budget, and some of his people have said this is a balanced budget with no new taxes over a 5-year period. Well, it is not a balanced budget, and there are new taxes on a lot of people, as you said, who have contracted for, worked for good insurance policies, and at the same time he says we are going to help the underinsured and the uninsured. What we see under the budget, it gets cut as well.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I go back to the day that we were sworn in and our Speaker saying that this was going to be a Congress that was dedicated to our children, and certainly, as everybody has pointed out, this budget that the President has sent out is just going in the opposite direction.

I would say, too, that in the Virgin Islands we do not get full SCHIP, we do not get full Medicare, and therefore, a lot of the services that even, meanwhile limited in the States, you take for granted, we are not even able to provide to our residents. Our veterans as well have to travel to Puerto Rico for their veterans care, and the cuts will cut deeply into their ability to travel to Puerto Rico to get the care that they need.

So, having just laid to rest two soldiers in the Virgin Islands, we are very sensitive to this issue, and we really have to sit down and work on this budget and ensure that our children, our veterans, our seniors receive the kind of health care that they need and deserve, and that we put that investment also to close the gaps in health care for people in our rural communities and people of color in this country.

Mr. PALLONE. I appreciate the gentlewoman's comments.

I just wanted to mention one more thing. The President in his budget message highlighted this SCHIP program, this kid care program, saying they are going to get another \$5 billion, which, as I said, is not enough to keep up with the kids currently in the program.

But at the same time the Medicaid program, which deals with those who really are in poverty and whose parents probably are not working because they are disabled or whatever their situation is, covers even more kids than the SCHIP, because SCHIP was put in place to try to supplement Medicaid.

So I asked this question of the Secretary. I did not even get a response, because in the President's budget Medicaid, which covers 23 million children, SCHIP only covers 6.6-. So Medicaid covers 23-, SCHIP covers 6.6-. They herald the fact that they are giving \$5 billion in extra dollars to SCHIP which does not even keep up with inflation, but in the same time over the 5 years, they cut Federal funding for Medicaid by \$25.7 billion, and Medicaid covers, what did we say, five times as many kids and five times the cut. So we are not even talking about the poor kids here. He is just saying, well, forget them. I mean, I am not even addressing the problem of the poor kids and what happens to them.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KAGEN. Well, the question then comes up, it is not just about values; it is about choices. So, if we are not going to be spending our hard-earned tax dollars for the good health of children, children who are in need, where are we going to spend that money? Where does the budget choose to spend it? Not here in our country, but in the sands of Iraq.

And I would suggest to you and everyone listening that we really cannot solve our health care problems, we really cannot solve many of the problems we are facing until we begin to bring an end to that involvement in that civil war in Iraq. I do not think any day should go by that we do not all stand up and ask the question where do you want to spend your hard-earned money, here at home or in the sands of Iraq?

You are quite correct; the budget the President has proposed is deficient, is neglectful to those who are most at risk, the children in poverty, and if you are not healthy, if you are not well fed, you cannot go to school and learn anything. If you do not get your education, you are not going to build a better future that we all require.

Mr. PALLONE. Can I just ask you, because I know you are a physician, when we talk about some of these programs like Medicaid, SCHIP, Medicare, and I know the gentlewoman from Florida brought it up. I know it is hard a lot of times when you are on the floor and you talk about doctors and they are not getting enough money for Medicare. They will say the doctors are all making a lot of money; why are you bringing that up?

The reality is we are getting to a crisis now where many physicians simply will not accept payment from some of these programs because the reimbursement rate has gotten so low.

Now, you mentioned Medicare, because that is the big one for seniors and the disabled, and how a lot of doctors now are not even looking to take Medicare, but when you talk about Medicaid, which I mentioned before, that has gotten to the point of no return.

Could I yield to you? Do doctors even take Medicaid in Wisconsin anymore?

Mr. KAGEN. Yes, they do. We go into medicine, most of us, because we care about people. We seek to solve problems for people.

The model at our clinic was how can we help you today. So we take people, and we take all people, but the real question is this: Is Medicare able to pay for the cost of producing the service at an institution? They do not. So that cost is shifted to others who can afford to pay, and those prices are sky high.

So many of the problems that we face, government has not really had its feet put to the fire saying, you know, you should pay for the cost of producing the service, at least for the overhead plus a margin of profit; you should pay for the entire cost of producing a medication or a vaccine, or it will not be there.

There are two ways to get rid of anything. Let us take cigarettes as the example. If you want to get rid of cigarettes, tax the heck out of it or do not pay for it. It will be gone. The same is true in health care. If you do not pay for the service, the institution at the hospital, it cannot stand. It cannot balance its budgets.

Most hospitals that I am familiar with in Wisconsin are running margins of profit anywhere from 3 to 5 percent, if they are profitable. So it is very difficult to make it.

But to summarize Medicare, it is over 40,000 pages of rules and regulations. I do not know that there is anyone that fully understands it, and just think of it as a mess, and it does need to be repaired. But I think the more important point is institutions, hospitals, research centers, educational facilities are not being compensated, and the people that will suffer are those yet to become aged, because we are not really adequately funding higher education for the physicians' training and their fellowships and the nurses' positions.

So there are a lot of problem to go after. I will not put you to sleep with the data.

Mr. PALLONE. Well, the one thing that I keep hearing, of course, with the hospitals is their ability to care for what they call uncompensated care. One of the things that the President proposed both in the State of the Union and his budget was to take money from the hospitals that get what they call disproportionate share, DSH. I hate to use these acronyms because it gets so bureaucratic, but your hospitals that have a disproportionate share of people that do not have health insurance, the uncompensated care.

Over the years, we have provided more funding for those hospitals through Medicare and other Federal programs so that they can cover the uninsured. Again, the President says we will give the States more money by cutting the payments to these disproportionate share hospitals.

In my home State of New Jersey, I mean, that is absurd. We have State legislators and the Governor now that are talking about trying to provide some kind of comprehensive health insurance so nobody in New Jersey goes without health insurance. The only way to do that is if the Federal Government provides some additional help in some of the ways we discussed tonight, but if you start cutting back on the funding that is going to these hospitals that cover all these uninsured people, it is like robbing Peter to pay Paul, I guess is the expression. It just does not work.

So I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KAGEN. It does not have to be that way. With the money we have already spent in Iraq, we could immunize every human on Earth with every vaccine that we know about for the next 95 years. We could have sent 14 million children, our children, to a college education. We could have built over 100, maybe 150, hospitals in each and every State in the Union. There is a lot we could be doing with the money we are spending overseas in Iraq, and it is all about values, and it is all about choices, and we are really getting to a tipping point, I believe, not just in our economy, but people feel it in their gut

that we are headed in the wrong direction still, even though the difference makers, the three of us that just got the opportunity to serve here in Congress, have arrived.

Ms. CASTOR. You all are absolutely right. It is very difficult to understand why the White House wants to sock it to our safety net hospitals. Have you all been to the emergency room lately, tried to get in? The long lines? People are ending up in our emergency rooms for their primary care because they have the flu. They are clogging the emergency rooms.

I was a county commissioner before I was elected to Congress, and the brave men and women in fire rescue said they would transport to the emergency room. It would be so busy and so full, they would have to stay with the emergency patient in the EMS truck for hours because the emergency room was clogged.

We have a crisis in this country, and it is inexplicable that the Bush administration would say by administrative rule and through this budget that has been sent to the Congress this week that we are going to cut money to those hospitals that provide the charity care in our country.

□ 1900

In my district, in the Tampa Bay area, the impact on Tampa General Hospital, which is a level one trauma center, \$64 million. The great All Children's Hospital across the bay in Saint Petersburg, \$31 million; the great St. Joseph's Hospital, another \$20 million.

I would like to go back to SCHIP and also talk about the real-world, children's health insurance, because a few months ago, I ran into a friend of mine from high school, haven't seen her since I graduated 20-something years ago, and I saw her at a children's health insurance discussion.

She told me her story. Her name is Nan Dorton, and she lives in Tampa. She is married and has three kids. Her husband went through a tough time, and he lost his job, so they lost their health insurance. They didn't know what to do. It was very, very tough times. They didn't know about children's health insurance in Florida called KidCare or Healthy Kids, because the State has cut back under Governor Jeb Bush and the Republican legislature and they don't do any more outreach, so it is hard to find out about it.

Fortunately, he got a job. They were provided with health insurance through the employer. But you know how much it costs for that family to have the kids covered, \$700 a month. She said it was hard to choose whether to put food on the table or take the kids to the doctor and sign them up for health insurance. She said, you live in constant fear of your child having to go to the hospital.

But then she found out about children's health insurance and KidCare, and signed them up. She said it revolutionized their lives because under these

health services, they pay a \$20-per-month copayment for all three kids, and they don't have any copays for hospital visits or prescriptions. You know how much money that is saving us because they are not showing up in the emergency room, which is passed on to all of us in our health insurance? That is going to save us because that family is healthier today, and we are going to save that money later on down the road.

Mr. PALLONE. You are absolutely right. I appreciate the fact that you talk about how, by covering kids or even adults, you save money in the emergency room or in hospitalization or whatever it is. But also, you mentioned the outreach, because I talked earlier about how you have more kids that are eligible for this children's health care program than are even in it. The reason is because a lot of States have cut back on outreach, so they don't tell people that they can apply. They don't even know about it. Some States may even be doing it on purpose because they want to save money in the short run. So that is why we talk about reauthorizing this and expanding it. You even need money for the outreach, which is clearly not in the budget.

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I thank my friend from New Jersey. Just for me, this past election was, the people wanted a new direction. They wanted checks and balances back in this country. They wanted a different perspective to be brought to the values of this Nation. As my friend from Wisconsin and my friend from New Jersey, my friend from Florida said, this budget that the President has presented reflects his values, but I don't think it reflects the values of this country.

Just as we did last week with the concurrent, with the continuing resolution, with the budget that we passed last week, we are going to reflect what I believe are the values of this country, whether it is with veterans. And I just notice, in the President's proposed budget, he is increasing medical care fees for military retirees. The budget increases enrollment fees and deductibles under TRICARE. I can tell you, as I have gone around, my area, Golden, Colorado, Brighton, Aurora, wherever it might be in the suburbs of Denver, those military retirees are already complaining about increases in TRICARE and cuts in benefits that come with respect to that, that we haven't fulfilled the promises that we have made for the great service that we have received from these men and women in our Armed Services.

Now, you know, what are our troops in Afghanistan and Iraq to expect? We are going to provide them with the best care and the best service that we can. And we have got to show prior military retirees that same respect. We have got to do it for our troops now. I question the President's budget on these things.

We are going to change the direction of this Nation. We are going to show what our values are, and they are the values of the people of this country. I am glad to be here, to be a check and balance on this current administration.

Mr. PALLONE. I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin again.

Mr. KAGEN. Would my colleague agree with me that we will never cut and run from our veterans?

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Absolutely, I will agree. We are not going to cut and run from our veterans. We are going to fulfill the promises that we have made to them for the services that they provided to our country.

Mr. KAGEN. Would my colleague agree that we will support the troops, but not this failed policy?

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Your colleague would agree with that, that our troops are giving us the greatest service, the greatest sacrifices, and they deserve better policies from those who are leading them, particularly, the White House and the administration. Our military is doing great, and we have got to live up to that greatness that they are providing.

Mr. KAGEN. One of the things that I learned by listening to people on the campaign trail, perhaps the greatest lesson, came from a Native American, an outspoken woman, Gwenn Carr, who said, Dr. KAGEN, it is not doctors that determine who lives and who dies, it is politicians. It is politicians that take us to war based on lies and deception. It is politicians that prevent people from having access to affordable health care that they require.

I will share with you a story of Jerry Gajeske. Jerry Gajeske I discovered by knocking on his door. It was not even on his door. It was in Waupaca, Wisconsin, with a college student who 2 days earlier in a dialysis center fainted because of the blood that was available for the eye to see.

We were at the door, and I knocked, a gentleman came and said, ha, are you a real doctor? I said, yes, sir, I am, but I am running for Congress now. He said, well, if you are a real doctor, would you take a look at my cousin?

I said, sure. Because there were barking dogs, I asked him to come out on the porch. While he went out to retrieve his cousin, I turned to my assistant, I said, Katie, are you going to be okay with this because you don't know what this is going to be. "Doc, what could it be?"

Well, his cousin came to the door and stepped out into the sunlight and had an obvious tumor protruding like a softball at the side of his sinus pushing his eye into the orbit. I said, sir, I can tell you it is not an allergy because I am an allergist, but what did your doctor say? He said, well, I saw my doctor several months ago. I could afford him, but I couldn't afford the tests. The tests were going to cost thousands of dollars. But I had lost my job. I had no

coverage. I didn't get the tests. I have been hanging out here. I have 75 bucks to my name hanging out here with my cousin.

Well, I said, that ends right now.

I took him to the local hospital and asked one of my colleagues to see him. We referred him to a tertiary care center. Several weeks ago, he died of a cancer of the sinus.

It is not bad enough that you have to find these people knocking on doors, trying to get elected to office to change things. It is not bad enough that he died without any money or by getting care delayed.

To me, the bad thing was he died of the same cancer that my golden retriever did. But my golden retriever got better health care than Jerry in this country at this time. Jerry didn't make it.

We will never know if by being seen early and diagnosed early, having the availability of the tests, the radiation, the chemotherapy, if he would not be here today. Don't think that it was opportunistic for me to tell this story, he didn't even live in my district.

Jerry is like many, many other people today, who have just fallen off the edge into the crack of the sidewalk; is not being forgotten. Our party, this time, will change health care, not State by State, but across the country and guarantee access to care for everyone.

I will share with you this story that I tell often about Jenny, a single mother of two asthmatic children, who came to see me, and I wrote some prescriptions for the children to get medicine for their asthma. They were missing school.

When she returned a month later, the children were still sick. I said, Jenny, you know, this is good medicine but it only works if you put it in their mouth. She took the same prescriptions out of her purse and said, here they are. I went to the pharmacy, I stood at the counter, and I could see the medicine, but I couldn't afford to put it in their mouth. What are you going to do? I said, well, I am going to run for Congress because I couldn't help her in the office.

I think, by working together, we can build a better future and a better Nation for everyone by changing our health care system now, not later.

Mr. PALLONE. I appreciate your comments, because I know, as a physician and someone so caring, that you really understand how these problems relate to individuals.

I also appreciate the fact that you brought up the issue of priorities, because when we spend so much on the war in Iraq, as you say, we don't have the money, and the gentleman from Colorado talked about the deficit. The fact of the matter is that the President and the Republicans built up this deficit for so long, and now it makes it more difficult for us to find the funds to pay to cover the uninsured in the same way that we are spending all this

money in Iraq, and it means that we don't have the money left.

If I could just conclude, because I know we are running out of time, I do appreciate the fact that, in his State of the Union Address and also in the budget message, that the President was prioritizing health care and pointing out that we have a big problem with the uninsured.

But unless the solutions and the money are there to lead us down the path of covering the uninsured or lowering health care costs, then it is not going to be good enough to just say that is a problem.

I think, as you say, when we talk about going in a new direction, it means that the Democrats and the Democratic majority are determined to not only highlight that these problems exist and that we need to cover the uninsured to reduce cost, but to come up with solutions that practically are going to make a difference. That is why I am so happy that not only are you both here tonight speaking, but just that you are here, because all the new Members and particularly the new Democratic Members, I think, are going to make it possible to address these problems in a practical way.

I would conclude, again, by thanking both of you and everyone who joined us tonight, because we are moving in a new direction, and it is going to make a difference. Thank you.

#### FREE BORDER PATROL AGENTS IGNACIO RAMOS AND JOSE COMPEAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, tonight I am privileged to yield to the second best surfer in Congress, Mr. DANA ROHRBACHER of the great State of California, and I yield to him whatever time he may consume.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, today we discuss a black mark on this administration, a vile crime against two law enforcement officers whose job has been protecting our families and communities and keeping control of America's borders. This sad episode started back on February 17, 2005, just another routine day for Border Patrol agents Ignacio Ramos and Jose Compean. Both were Border Patrol veterans with unblemished service records. Agent Ramos, in fact, had been nominated for Border Patrol Agent of the Year.

As they did their rounds that day 2 years ago, a trip sensor at the border was discovered, and Agent Compean then discovered footprints and drag marks, a usual indication of a drug load being smuggled across the river. He then spotted a vehicle and radioed the description and then followed the suspect. The suspect realized he had been made and turned around to rush back towards Mexico.

Agent Ramos then spotted the van driving at a high rate of speed. After the driver ignored all commands to pull over, of course, Ramos gave chase.

By the way, according to the prosecuting attorney, pursuing fleeing suspects without a supervisor's permission is against Border Patrol policy.

This, in and of itself, is an insane policy. The drug smuggler who they were pursuing abandoned his vehicle and fled toward Mexico on foot but was intercepted by Agent Compean. Once again, ignoring several commands by Agent Compean to stop, a physical altercation ensued with Compean ending up in a ditch.

While seeing his opportunity, the smuggler then ran toward the border, which was nearby. According to Agent Compean's sworn testimony, while running, the suspect turned and pointed with something shiny in his left hand. Believing his life was in danger, Agent Compean opened fire. Hearing gunshots, Agent Ramos came to his side, and he, too, shouted for the smuggler to stop.

□ 1915

But instead of obeying his command, the illegal drug smuggler once again turned as he ran and again pointed something shiny at the officers. Ramos, believing it to be a weapon, fired one shot. After disappearing into the banks of the Rio Grande, the smuggler reappeared on the Mexican side where he jumped into a waiting van. Unbeknownst to the officers, Ramos's bullet may have hit the illegal drug smuggler in the left buttocks.

Minutes after the shooting, seven other agents were on the scene, including two supervisors. When the abandoned van was examined, 743 pounds of marijuana were found. The payload was seized, and one would think congratulations would have been in order. Agent Ramos and Compean are heroes, right? They are responsible for taking off the streets \$1 million worth of drugs bound for our communities. Good job fellows, right? Wrong.

At this moment Agents Ramos and Compean, not the illegal drug smuggler, are languishing in a Federal prison serving 11- and 12-year sentences. This is the worst miscarriage of justice that I have seen in my 25 years of public service. It is a nightmare for the two Border Patrol agents and their families, these Border Patrol agents who willingly risk their lives protecting us for 5 and 10 years.

The whole rotten episode turned justice on its head. The book was thrown at our heroes who protect us, while the drug smugglers got immunity. According to the U.S. attorney, Johnny Sutton, a Bush appointee and a longtime friend of the President, Ramos and Compean are not heroes. In fact, he considers those two officers to be criminals, charging them with assault with serious bodily injury, assault with a deadly weapon, discharge of a firearm while committing a crime of violence,

which carries, of course, a minimum mandatory sentence of 10 years, and a civil rights violation.

Sutton claims that he had no choice but to prosecute the two Border Patrol agents because, according to Sutton, they broke the law when they violated these procedures concerning the discharge of their weapons at this fleeing suspect.

No. Even if procedures were not followed, Sutton could have granted immunity to the law enforcement officers and thrown the book at the drug smuggler. That was his choice. He chose the side of the drug smuggler and threw the book at the Border Patrol agents. This was an indefensible decision, and now Sutton lies to us and to the American people, suggesting that he did not have a choice, that he had to prosecute.

Well, the facts don't back him up. And what happened after this man got away? After the incident the drug smuggler contacted Renee Sanchez, a childhood friend for advice.

Now, why did she contact Renee Sanchez? Because Renee Sanchez happens to be a current Border Patrol agent in Arizona. And instead of turning in this drug smuggler, turning the drug smuggler over to the authorities for prosecution, this law enforcement officer, Agent Sanchez, he is sworn to uphold the laws of the United States, but he chose to personally intervene on behalf of his childhood friend who was a known mule for the drug cartels.

He was also called as a character witness on the drug smuggler's behalf during the trial. Mr. Sanchez contacted the Department of Homeland Security, who in turn decided to open an investigation into the conduct of Ramos and Compean. What? What? You have got a drug smuggler with 750 pounds of narcotics who is being thwarted from making his delivery, and that he complains that he was shot at, and our Government decides to investigate the law enforcement officers.

Mr. Sutton had every chance to focus his enormous prosecutorial powers on the drug dealer, but he chose to target the law enforcement officers. He chose to turn a procedural violation into a criminal act rather than prosecuting a career drug smuggler.

As part of their investigation, the Department of Homeland Security Office of Inspector General sent a special agent to Mexico to offer the drug smuggler immunity in exchange for testimony against the Border Patrol officers. The smuggler was then brought back to the United States and given free medical care at all taxpayers' expense.

Now, one has to wonder if Mr. Sutton, our U.S. attorney, would have even spent one-tenth of that effort trying to find this criminal himself and track him down in Mexico so that he could be extradited and punished for smuggling narcotics into our country. No. No effort was made to do that. Instead, an expensive Herculean effort



was made to try to get the Border Patrol agents.

Now the drug smuggler is being portrayed as a victim because he swears he was not armed. Our government takes the word of this nefarious character over two law enforcement officers. In short, the initial decision to prosecute the two Border Patrol agents instead of the drug smuggler was indefensible. Period.

Sutton's only defense, to cover up this horrendous decision, has been to lie and to demonize the two Border Patrol agents. Well, it just does not jive.

According to that investigative report, Agent Compean's sworn statement, in his sworn statements he repeatedly stated he believed the drug smuggler had a weapon and felt threatened. The Border Patrol training manuals allow for this type of deadly force to be used when an agent fears imminent bodily injury or death. Both of the officers say they saw this drug smuggler turn and point what they believed to be a weapon in their direction while he was running away. The wound created by the bullet corroborates their version of the events.

So we have the prosecutor, even with the direction of the trajectory of the bullet as indicated by the wound, but the prosecutor is ignoring the fact that it backs up the Compean and Ramos position.

During the trial an Army doctor, a prosecution witness I might add, testified that the drug smuggler's body was bladed away from the bullet that struck him. That is consistent with the motion of a left-handed person running away while pointing backwards, causing his body to twist.

Once again, this corroborated Ramos's and Compean's belief that the smuggler had a weapon. And that was a reasonable belief considering the smuggler was transporting over \$1 million of drugs that day. And I am sure, of course, drug dealers with \$1 million worth of drugs are not armed.

Now, it is important to understand that only three individuals were eyewitnesses to the crucial events of that day, the two accused Border Patrol agents and a self-admitted drug smuggler. Those are the only two people who saw what happened. The other Border Patrol agents who responded to the scene testified under immunity, and quite often contradicting themselves; however, the most important thing when thinking about their testimony is their view of the events was completely obscured by a levee at the road, which is about 12 feet higher than the road on which they stood, and about 8 feet higher from the spot on the other side of the levee where Ramos and Compean stood and where they fired their pistols.

So let me make it very clear what I just said. None of the other agents could possibly have seen what transpired between Ramos and Compean and this drug smuggler, even if they climbed on top of their vehicles. It was

physically impossible for them to see. Yet these agents were threatened with prosecution if they did not testify against Ramos and Compean. They agreed to testify. If they agreed, they would be granted immunity. It begs the question why these agents need to be granted immunity if they were not involved in the incident, and this whole thing calls into question what effect that this threat that was held over their head had on the truthfulness of their testimony.

The U.S. attorney's version of what happened that day relies almost exclusively on the testimony of the drug smuggler. Despite the fact that there were seven other agents, including two supervisors on scene within minutes, no report of the shooting was ever filed, even though the Border Patrol regulations require the supervisors to file the report.

Agents are only required to orally notify their supervisors, and Ramos and Compean justifiably believed that their supervisors were totally aware that there was a shooting. They were within about 50 feet or 100 feet of what was going on. So, as a matter of fact, the agents, those agents are prohibited from actually filing a written report, as in INS firearms policy, section 12B, 1G states: Ensure that supervisory personnel or investigative officers are aware that employees involved in a shooting incident shall not be required or allowed to submit a written statement of the circumstances surrounding the incident. All written statements regarding the incident shall be prepared by the local investigative officers and shall be based on an interview of the employee. That is what their regulations state.

Yet U.S. Attorney Johnny Sutton continues to claim that the officers filed a false report to cover up their crime. They are not even permitted to file a report, much less a false report. And they were not asked by their supervisors who heard the shots.

So the supervisors decided not to ask questions about it, probably because had they then officially known about the incident, they would have had to fill out about 5 hours' worth of paperwork. This is about bureaucratic requirements of the people at the border. If one shot is fired, on their own time they end up having to work about 5 hours.

Because it looked like the incident was over, all of them, including the supervisors, decided to just close the book. Was that a good decision? Well, probably not, considering that you have an out-of-control prosecutor trying to find something to prosecute our defenders about.

By no means did their actions rise to the level of criminality, what might be considered an unauthorized discharge of their weapons, because, of course, they could not absolutely prove they knew that the drug dealer had a weapon. Well, if they could not absolutely prove it, then according to the U.S. At-

torney, they are guilty of attempted murder.

Again, let me note, the agents thought the drug dealer was aiming something at them. He had just been in a physical altercation with one of the officers. Of course, when it came to the details about that, our U.S. attorney believed the drug dealer, who swears that Compean, for example, in the altercation just fell down.

You know, you would be surprised how many police officers just fall down in the middle of trying to enforce the law when dealing with professional criminals like the ones that Compean and Ramos were dealing with. Just fell down. Yeah.

You believe that, but you do not believe these guys with an unblemished record of 5 and 10 years of protecting the American people. So even though this investigation determined that all seven officers on the scene knew about or heard the shooting, the U.S. attorney granted those officers immunity even though it was their job to report the incident.

But of course they did not think it was an incident, they thought it was closed, the guns went off. They did not want to spend 5 hours filling out paperwork. Well, guess what? It was their job to do it. Actually one of them was actually promoted after all of this.

But the U.S. attorney decided to prosecute the Border Patrol agents, and in doing so, he had to intimidate these supervisors by saying that he was going to charge them and giving them immunity unless they went along with this legal lynching of Ramos and Compean.

□ 1930

If this incident would have been kept in perspective, all seven supervisors and agents who were failing to report a shooting that may or may not have been consistent with regulations governing the discharge of weapons, but just keep this all in perspective, they might have deserved a disciplinary action, maybe a week without pay or some mark on their record; that would have been the end of it. But the penalty for not reporting a shooting is a 5-day suspension. That is the maximum penalty. This was an issue of a procedural violation, not criminality, and there is a serious question about the viability of those procedures which are mandated by the policy. This, of course, flows directly from the insane border policy, and it led directly to this unconscionable situation.

Over 78 Members of Congress have expressed concern, if not outrage, at the troubling aspects of this case. Our repeated attempts for Presidential intervention or even to communicate with the President have been ignored. Our pleas to keep the officers out of jail on bond pending their appeal have been denied. The President could have just had the prosecutor go to the judge and say, please, let these guys stay out at least until their appeal. No, no. It was

the opposite. They insisted on the maximum. They wanted their pound of flesh. The maximum penalty, the maximum message to other Border Patrol agents: Don't you dare ever to even think about firing your weapon at the border.

Instead, the President, after we appealed to try to get him to look at this, the President dug in his heels, sent Tony Snow out to chastise us, you know. We were trying to save Ramos and Compean, and then we were told by Tony Snow to take a closer look at the facts.

Well, we have taken a closer look at the facts. We also know what happened. There has been a publicity campaign that has been put out to destroy and demonize Ramos and Compean even as they languish in prison, because the Federal prosecutor knows he is the one who made the mistake. He made the initial decision to grant immunity to the drug dealer, rather than for a procedural mistake by the Border Patrol agents. He made that decision. It is a horrendous decision, and he is trying to cover it up and destroying the lives of these two Border Patrol agents in the process. That is what he has to do. So he has gone on the air waves and lied to the public to discredit these agents.

We found out today, for example, that the Department of Homeland Security lied to Congress trying to cover up for their lies to Congress. What happened is five Members of Congress were briefed. We will hear about this later on tonight from another Member of Congress. They were told that Compean had claimed he was going to go out and shoot a Mexican. Now, here is Compean, Jose Compean, right? These are two Mexican American, proud Hispanics, and they were going to go out and shoot a Mexican. And this is from five or six areas that were just total lies given to Members of Congress looking into this. And then they were questioned, when the Department of Homeland Security investigators were questioned, they said, oh, yes, we have all of this proved in various reports. And so they asked for them, those reports. And today it was just determined that for 4 months the Department of Homeland Security has been lying to Members of Congress because those reports never existed. There was nothing to substantiate the charges, the horrendous charges that were made against Compean and Ramos.

Well, what we hear now is, well, you have got to just forget it because the jury has spoken. That is what Mr. Sutton and the prosecutor want to say. That is the end of it. That is the last word.

Well, let's look at what the jury knew about and whether or not this was a fair trial. The drug dealer we are talking about, in between the time he was shot and all of this was going on, and Ramos and Compean are waiting to be tried, he was caught again, this time with 1,000 pounds of marijuana that he

was trying to smuggle into our country. But that information was kept from the jury. That information never made it to the jury.

Now, was that important for the jury to know? The prosecution told the judge that this would in some way jeopardize other prosecutions or investigations, so the jury was kept from that information. And, in fact, that information has been expunged from the record, so we can't get that information. But we know it happened. And they play word games with us to say, well, he really wasn't arrested. He was apprehended. No, this man was caught again with 1,000 pounds of drugs. Do you think the jury should have known that? Would that have been something important for the jury to know when they are deciding on the lives of these two brave Americans? Well, it is something that the jury never knew.

The jury also never knew that the drug dealer, after the bullet fragment was removed from his body, he was taken by an investigator, and the bullet was taken by the investigator and spent the night at the home of this agent.

Well, let me tell you something. You don't take evidence and break the chain of custody of evidence. He took the bullet into his home, and he took this witness into his home. Any lawyer will tell you that this is the type of sloppiness that taints the evidence and disqualifies a prosecution.

It is also significant to mention that of those 12 jurors, three of them later submitted sworn affidavits alleging that they had been misled by the jury foreman into believing that, if the majority of people wanted to vote guilty, they had to also vote guilty, that a hung jury was not going to be allowed by the judge. They felt pressured to vote guilty, and they have since signed affidavits and made statements that they would have changed their vote. They believed these men to be innocent, and some of them actually broke down in tears when they heard that they could have actually saved these men had they stuck to their guns. But they were told that the judge, these are not lawyers, these are simple people; they were told they had to go along with the majority.

And when the judge heard this, and the judge heard that there was evidence, he knew that this evidence had been kept from the jury, he, even after knowing this, denied the request that the two agents be permitted to stay out on bond until their appeal was made.

Well, let's look at this. There is no doubt that Johnny Sutton had a choice. This U.S. attorney decided to prosecute the good guys and gave immunity to the bad guys when he could have done it the other way around. But he chose not to. And now he is engaged in this propaganda campaign against these two men.

Well, the prosecution's only witness of course, the major witness testified

that, of course, this drug smuggler was hit in the buttocks, not from the back. And even with that, we hear the U.S. attorney claiming that the essence of this case is these corrupt agents shot an unarmed man in the back. That is what he says.

Well, of course, this was not an unarmed man. You know, we are not talking about a nun or some tourist who happened to stray across the border. This was a professional drug smuggler who works for a drug cartel, a delivery man to deliver vile drugs into our communities to corrupt our children and destroy the lives of our families. These Border Patrol agents were up against this man, not just a man, a criminal of this level. And of course, they didn't, as I just said, they didn't shoot him in the back. One bullet, we think, maybe from the gun of one of these officers, actually shot him in the buttocks, but the medical officer said that he was turned around. So it was like he had something that he was pointing with his hand, which could well have been a gun. So it wasn't in the back. It was in the buttocks, and it confirms what the law enforcement officers were saying.

Now, let me say, remember this, this is really important. There is no way to know that this drug dealer, whether he was armed or not. Mr. Sutton chose to believe the drug dealer, but how do we know he wasn't armed that day? The two agents claimed they said they saw something in his hand. They have to take the word of the drug smuggler. Now, he has been smuggling drugs since he was 14, and his family in an interview said he always was armed. There is no question. He was a member of the drug cartel.

But Mr. Sutton, our U.S. attorney, takes his word over the word of our defenders. He has turned reality on its head. He has sided with a drug smuggler over two men who risk their lives every day to protect us, and now he must destroy them and vilify them in order to protect this horrendous decision that he made to go with the bad guys rather than the good guys.

There is no evidence, for example, that Mr. Sutton claims they were corrupt. The Wall Street Journal printed an editorial saying these are corrupt law enforcement officers. Corrupt. The Wall Street Journal vilified these two men. Of course the Wall Street Journal, of course, has a policy, an editorial policy of an open border policy. But now, to back up their guy, their open borders guy, they vilify these officers with a total falsehood. There has never been a charge of corruption against either one of these two agents. They have never been charged with corruption. They have, in fact, a totally clean work record.

And, yes, Ramos had some family problems a few years ago. And let's make it clear what has happened. Another part of this vilification campaign is that Mr. Sutton, even though he was not permitted to bring this up in the

court because it is totally irrelevant, brought up a family problem that Officer Ramos had many years ago. This is a despicable tactic on the part of the U.S. attorney. Indefensible. Except it does illuminate what this U.S. attorney is all about.

The family situation for Mr. Ramos was recognized as an aberration. The fact is, Ramos has been recognized as a solid and respected officer, and this is why he was nominated for Border Patrol agent of the year.

And of course the U.S. attorney says, oh, well, that is not true. He never became Border Patrol agent of the year. That is the type of dishonest communication that calls into question his entire decision-making process. No one has ever claimed he was Border Patrol agent of the year. But he was nominated for that, and that means something.

So our U.S. attorney has found that he is just compelled to vilify these people. So what is the real significance of this case? The U.S. attorney's despicable prosecution of these border agents has put all of our border agents on notice: Any use of force to protect America, to secure our borders, if you do that, use any force, you will go to prison and your life will be destroyed and you will be shown no mercy.

The consequences of the Ramos and Compean case extend far beyond the destruction of these two men and their families. And yes, it is horrible that these families are being driven into destitution. The Compeans have lost their home. Their kids and the family, all their family is shattered. They have no health insurance.

But what are the consequences for us? What does it mean for our families? I will tell you what it means: It means that our southern border is now open, not just to an invading army of illegal immigrants but to drug dealers and to terrorists.

Let's ask ourselves this question: What if that van that they found all the drugs in, what if it turned out to be a dirty bomb that they discovered, a dirty bomb headed towards a major city that would have destroyed the lives of hundreds of thousands if not millions of Americans? Instead of 750 pounds of drugs, which is bad enough, what if it was a dirty bomb? And what if the drug dealer turned out to be a terrorist instead of a Mexican national?

Well, those two men would have been invited to the White House to be congratulated. It is clear there is a larger and a hidden agenda at play here. And Ramos and Compean simply are pawns who got in the way.

Johnny Sutton is a dishonest and overzealous prosecutor who has lied to us about this case. And he is on the wrong side of the law by siding with drug smugglers, letting them go free while he is prosecuting two men for criminal activity when it may just well have been a procedural matter.

His claim of not being able to prosecute the drug smuggler is ludicrous.

Both his office and the investigation have no trouble in tracking down the drug smuggler, yet he chose to turn a blind eye to the drug smuggler's offenses. And according to the investigation, there were lots of prints, sets of prints that he could have used on that van. Plus we had agents Ramos and Compean who identified him as the guy who jumped out of that van. They could have prosecuted the drug smuggler. But they chose to prosecute our heroes, our defenders.

Well, did Ramos and Compean make mistakes? Well, maybe they did. Should they have been punished and reprimanded for them? Maybe. Should they have been charged with a crime? Absolutely not. And by doing so, the Justice Department has demoralized our Nation's defenders. And what does that mean to us? That means that our defenders cannot now count on their government to support them even when they are up against a drug smuggler who may very well be armed.

□ 1945

What does that mean for the rest of us? That means we have absolutely lost control of our border. Border agents are put in a situation on a daily basis that they must make a split-second decision.

By the way, this is the first time Compean has ever used his weapon in the 5 years of service. He is being portrayed as some trigger-happy Border Patrol agent? Well, these agents don't have a second chance when someone aims something at them. So this policy that you can't fire until you are in the sights of a drug smuggler's gun is a death warrant to our defenders. Ironically, Ramos and Compean thought that the drug smuggler was aiming at them. Interestingly, as I say, Compean had never fired his weapon before.

These are the facts. These are the facts that have enraged the public, causing Americans to wonder what in God's name is their government doing? What is their President thinking? How can our President be so mean-spirited and arrogant not to hear the pleas from so many of our citizens, even from Members of Congress, for some type of mercy for Ramos and Compean, who had risked their lives to defend us for so long?

Well, there is a hidden agenda here. That is what this is all about. Very powerful economic interests in this country want cheap labor. They want open borders. They want cheap labor from illegals to come here so they can depress the wages of working Americans.

Well, the out-of-control flow of illegal immigrants is a nightmare to regular Americans, not this one group of elitists. But the policymakers here in Washington and their elite corporate interests are so arrogant and so smug that they do not care about the suffering of the American people. They don't care. These elites don't care that illegal immigrants are shutting down

the emergency rooms so if your children in California have a car accident, they will die. They are overcrowding our classrooms so our kids aren't getting the education they deserve. They are driving down wages. And our criminal justice system is breaking down in California. We have American citizens who are being victimized. They are being murdered and raped and robbed by criminal illegal immigrants every day. But these elitists don't care, and our President doesn't seem to care.

The only heroes in this entire immigration mess, the only heroes are the thin green line of the Border Patrol. And the elites now have decided they have to brutally smash two of them in order to warn the others not to get in the way of their open border policy.

The public has every right to be angry about this case, and I join them in this outrage. Let me note that today I received 304,000 petitions that were signed by citizens of this country for the President of the United States asking for pardon. As we know, Officer Ramos was attacked last night or the night before. He was brutally attacked in prison. And this should do nothing but ask for another plea. This man's life is in danger. Compean's life was in danger. We knew that. That is why they should have been out until their appeal is heard.

We are pleading with the President. The American people are asking the President to pay attention. Please pardon these men. Give them a chance. If they are murdered in prison, the President will be held accountable. The President is accountable of the fact that Ramos was beaten up.

This case shows the insanity of this administration's border policy and perhaps the hidden agenda of this border policy. No guest worker program, no amnesty program is going to be feasible if we cannot control our borders. If this country cannot stop an illegal alien drug smuggler, this country has no border controls whatsoever.

And let me end my comments by this following statement: Our job is to watch out for the interests of the people of the United States. The people of the United States and many of these illegals who stream across our border are wonderful people. The vast majority are wonderful people. But we have to be concerned about the interests of our people who are suffering because of this out-of-control illegal immigration flow.

United States, who is it? It is us, U.S. Who are we? We are Mexican American people just like Ramos and Compean. We are Irish Americans. We are black Americans. We are people who came here from every corner of the world. And if we don't have a consideration for Americans over and above what we care about people in other countries, then we will not have an America that our Founding Fathers dreamed about. We are losing our country. And if we lose control of the southern border, the terrorists and the drug dealers and the

invading armies of illegals will make it so that within a short period of time, maybe 10 years from now, maybe 20, we will have lost America.

The American people are crying out in a rage. The President should listen. The President has to listen.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from California.

And at this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentleman from the great State of North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. BILBRAY, I want to thank you very much for yielding. You will soon be the leading the Immigration Caucus here in Washington, D.C., that is involved with many Members from both parties and who are concerned about the future of this great Nation.

To my friend Mr. ROHRABACHER, I want to thank him for his passionate feelings tonight. The American people had to feel that.

I want to say to you, Mr. BILBRAY and Mr. ROHRABACHER, that we have for the last 7 months, a large number of us, have been fighting for these two border agents.

I am not going to try to repeat anything that has been said. I want to be short in my time because of the limited time that is left tonight. But I want to say that, as Mr. ROHRABACHER articulated every aspect of this case, there is nothing I could add to it except this: We have written, at least myself alone, four letters to the President of the United States going back to August 21 of 2006. We have a letter today, which will be the fifth letter. Many of these letters by me personally have been signed by at least 30 to 40 Members of Congress. Mr. ROHRABACHER had one back in December signed by 50 Members. And I want to join him very briefly. Why will this administration not listen to the truth?

And I am not going to try to articulate anything that has already been said, but these men are heroes in this country. I don't know how these Hispanic Americans, and that is what they are, a great part of America, Hispanic Americans, Compean and Ramos, how their families could believe in America tonight, with their loved ones who tried to fight drug traffickers in this country. Their husbands tonight, Ramos and Compean, are in the Federal prisons. And as was said by Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. Ramos last Saturday night was beaten up by Mexican nationals.

I close my brief comments tonight by saying to the President of the United States, please listen to the Members of Congress. But more important than the Members of Congress, listen to the American people. For the last 8 months they have been calling talk shows throughout this great Nation and saying to the President of the United States please pardon these men.

And when I heard Tony Snow answer the question a month ago and said that this is nonsensical, Mr. Snow, wake up

yourself. Awaken the President to what has happened. These men deserve to be heroes, not to be crucified by this government.

If we believe in justice, Mr. President, and I hope and believe that you do believe in justice, then soon, in the next few days, you will grant a pardon to these two men.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend for this brief time. And that is all I needed was this brief time.

Mr. BILBRAY. I appreciate the gentleman from North Carolina.

And at this time I yield to the gentleman from the Volunteer State, the great State of Tennessee, Chattanooga's favorite son, Congressman WAMP.

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me.

I came to the Capitol tonight to actually take the eighth-graders from Silverdale Baptist Church on a Capitol tour here, which I am going to do downstairs in a few minutes. But this is a very important issue that really strikes to the heart of what our priorities are in this country today.

My responsibilities here in Washington and in this Congress are, as the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, charged with resourcing the legislative branch. We ask Capitol Police officers and the Sergeant at Arms personnel to stand in harm's way on our behalf. I have got to tell you all across the country we are asking men and women of all ethnic backgrounds, all religions, all cultures who are proud to be called Americans to stand in harm's way on behalf of our civilian population and, in this case, our elected leadership in this country. And you can't ask them to do that and then send the wrong signals by not standing with them when they are doing their job. And I know that people are entitled to due process, but this is one of those obvious cases where the President needs to get involved and take decisive action.

My district director in Chattanooga's son works for Border Patrol on the southern border. It is a difficult job. These people are harassed. Their lives are on the line all the time. It is a tough, nasty business. It does not always go perfectly, but if we are ever going to recruit new people to serve and to stand in the gap on behalf of our country, we have to stand behind the people that do. I don't think we have done that. I do not think due process has, frankly, been served here. And I think the President should take action, and I was proud to join on the letters asking the President to do this.

Thoughtful people from all across the country are saying what in the world is going on? How could this happen? And I want that next generation of Border Patrol agents to be recruited and know that their country is not going to leave them hanging and leave them in Federal prison for doing their job. It is dangerous. Our country needs to stand

behind them. And these are difficult days. Our generation is going to be called to enormous sacrifice. We have got to make difficult decisions on whether or not we are going to stick together, because if we do not hang together, we will indeed hang separately.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chance to be able to present this issue before this body. I think that, as the Congressional Immigration Caucus has pointed out, there is an issue here that obviously the American people are interested in and we were able to present tonight.

I just have to close with a few comments. One is the fact that the White House has discussed that there are procedures they have to go through. I think it is quite clear to anyone who reads the Constitution that the White House, the President, does not have to go through any procedure except to the decide either to pardon or not to pardon.

We hear a lot over the years of Executive privilege. Executive privilege. And every White House since George Washington has loved to discuss the concept of Executive privilege. But with that privilege goes Executive responsibility. And the White House bears the responsibility and the sole responsibility to issue pardons where there has been a miscarriage of justice. And I think the consensus is among many of us that this is exactly the kind of situation that the Founding Fathers had in mind when they proposed that the Executive and only the Executive would have this power, and this unencumbered power, separate from other procedures, to be able to right a wrong when the justice system has failed. I think that this is a chance that we can talk about.

But the thing that concerns me, Mr. Speaker, as being a Member who was born and raised on the border, I think that what has happened in Texas with this case reflects the total lack of understanding of just how out of control our borders are.

I hear people again and again in the Federal Government say that there are not the resources down at the border to be able to enforce the laws against drug smugglers, that there just isn't enough money and manpower to be able to address the problem, that we must allow these people to go free.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if there was enough money to go down into Mexico, find a drug smuggler, negotiate a backroom deal with this drug smuggler, bring the drug smuggler back, and give them amnesty not just once but twice, if there were enough resources to cut this kind of deal and make this kind of effort to make sure that two Border Patrol agents get convicted, my God, aren't there enough resources to use the same effort to go after the drug smugglers? And I really ask that we consider that.

I would just like to say that tonight we were able to spend almost an hour discussing an issue that is very near

and dear to those who are concerned about the fact that our borders are out of control, that this incident happened in an area where Border Patrol agents had a firefight with smugglers with automatic weapons a few months ago, if you remember. And we wanted to remind the American people how out of control and absurd the situation has become in a lot of ways.

We hope, as the Congressional Immigration Caucus, Mr. Speaker, that over the next few months that Wednesday night will be spent as a night where those of us who are concerned about the illegal immigration issue and the out-of-control border will spend an hour every Wednesday night reporting to the American people of what is going on, on this most critical issue that Democrats and Republicans both care about.

□ 2000

If there was ever a situation and ever an issue where partisanship should be put aside and being an American should be first, it is time that we find a way to work together on the immigration issue. I call on you and everyone that has the honor of working in this House of the people to join together to address that. I invite you and every Member of the House to join the Immigration Caucus, so that we can work together for the good of all Americans.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ROYCE (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of illness.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McDERMOTT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. McDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ELLISON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KAGEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TIAHRT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, February 12, 13, and 14.

Mrs. CAPITO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GINGREY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PEARCE, for 5 minutes, today. Ms. PELOSI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mrs. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 434. An act to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 through July 31, 2007, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 8, 2007, at 10 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

524. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 07-13, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

525. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the annual report relating to the prevention of nuclear proliferation from January 1 to December 31, 2005, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3281(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

526. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Cote d'Ivoire that was declared in Executive Order 13396 of February 7, 2006, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

527. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Liberia that was declared in Executive Order 13348 of July 22, 2004, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

528. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting the Agency's reports containing the 30 September 2006 status of loans and guarantees issued under Section 25(a)(11) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

529. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to Section 620C(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and in accordance with section 1(a)(6) of Executive Order 13313, a report prepared by the Department of State and the National Security Council on the progress

toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period October 1, 2006 through November 30, 2006; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

530. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting consistent with the resolution of advice and consent to ratification of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling, and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction, adopted by the Senate of the United States on April 24, 1997, and Executive Order 13346 of July 8, 2004, certification pursuant to Condition 7(C)(i), Effectiveness of the Australia Group; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

531. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the annual inventory of U.S. Government-sponsored international exchanges and training programs, as well as the FY 2006 report on the activities of the Interagency Working Group on U.S. Government-Sponsored International Exchanges and Training (IAWG); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

532. A letter from the Chief, Administrative Law Division, Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

533. A letter from the Secretary, Mississippi River Commission, Department of the Army, Department of Defense, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act covering the calendar year 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

534. A letter from the Assoc. Gen. Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

535. A letter from the Assoc. Gen. Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

536. A letter from the Assoc. Gen. Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

537. A letter from the Assoc. Gen. Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

538. A letter from the Assoc. Gen. Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

539. A letter from the Assoc. Gen. Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

540. A letter from the Senior Associate General Counsel, Office of the Director of National Intelligence, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

541. A letter from the Senior Associate General Counsel, Office of the Director of National Intelligence, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

542. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for the Alabama Beach Mouse (RIN: 1018-AU46) received January 25, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

543. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of Justice Programs, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Grants for Correctional Facilities [OJP (OJP)-Docket No. 1382] (RIN: 1121-AA41) received January 23, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

544. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification to Congress regarding the Incidental Capture of Sea Turtles in Commercial Shrimping Operations; jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources and Appropriations.

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee: Committee on Science and Technology. H.R. 365. A bill to provide for a research program for remediation of closed methamphetamine production laboratories, and for other purposes (Rept. 110-8). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 133. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 547) to facilitate the development of markets for alternative fuels and Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel fuel through research, development, and demonstration and data collection (Rept. 110-9). Referred to the House Calendar.

### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. NORWOOD (for himself, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. FLAKE, Ms. FOXX, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HERGER, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. ISSA, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KELLER, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCHENRY, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 866. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to ensure the right of employees to a secret-ballot election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

H.R. 867. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the provision for penalty-free withdrawals from individual retirement plans for qualified reservist distributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOLT, Mr. KIND, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. STARK, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ):

H.R. 868. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a married couple who operates a unincorporated business as co-owners to file separate self-employment tax returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia (for himself, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. HARE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. POE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN):

H.R. 869. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to revive previous authority on the use of the Armed Forces and the militia to address interference with State or Federal law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GILLMOR (for himself, Ms. DeGETTE, and Mr. TAYLOR):

H.R. 870. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide liability protections for employees and contractors of health centers under section 330 of such Act who provide health services in emergency areas; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WEXLER:

H.R. 871. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to strengthen enforcement of spousal court-ordered property distributions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 872. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make competitive grants to community colleges and advanced technology education centers partnering with community colleges to support the education and training of technicians in the fields of bioenergy and other agriculture-based, renewable energy resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ACKERMAN (for himself and Mrs. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 873. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to prohibit fees by creditors for payments on credit card accounts by electronic fund transfers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CARDOZA:

H.R. 874. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide an additional penalty for public officials who abuse their office in furtherance of a felony; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARDOZA:

H.R. 875. A bill to amend the Federal Financial Management Improvement Act of

1996 to require the head of an agency to be reconfirmed by the Senate unless the agency is found to be in compliance with the requirements of such Act, as reported by the Comptroller General; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. LAMPSON, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Mr. CRAMER):

H.R. 876. A bill to modernize and expand the reporting requirements relating to child pornography, to expand cooperation in combating child pornography, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELAHUNT:

H.R. 877. A bill to amend the Adams National Historical Park Act of 1998 to include the Quincy Homestead within the boundary of the Adams National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. EMANUEL (for himself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. SRES, and Ms. HIRONO):

H.R. 878. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require broker reporting of customer's basis in securities transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FEENEY:

H.R. 879. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require individuals to present a government-issued photo identification as a condition of voting in elections for Federal office, to prohibit any individual from tabulating votes in an election for Federal office unless the individual has been subject to a criminal background check, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FORBES (for himself, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. COBLE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. PENCE, and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 880. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to reduce violent gang crime and protect law-abiding citizens and communities from violent criminals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELDON of Florida (for himself and Mrs. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 881. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to reduce human exposure to mercury through vaccines; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GORDON (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. HAYES, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. SENBRENNER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. HOLT, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. DENT, Mr. SOUDER, and Ms. ROYBAL-AL-LARD):

H.R. 882. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to emergency medical services and the quality of care furnished in emergency departments of hospitals and critical access hospitals by establishing a bipartisan commission to examine factors that affect the effective delivery of such services, by providing for additional payments for certain physician services furnished in such emergency departments, and by requiring reports on certain emergency department information as a condition of participation in the Medicare Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined



by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. HERSETH:

H.R. 883. A bill to enhance and provide to the Oglala Sioux Tribe and Angostura Irrigation Project certain benefits of the Pick-Sloan Missouri River basin program; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. REICHERT, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. DENT, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, and Mr. MCNULTY):

H.R. 884. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Science and Technology Homeland Security International Cooperative Programs Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 885. A bill to support the establishment of an international regime for the assured supply of nuclear fuel for peaceful means and to authorize voluntary contributions to the International Atomic Energy Agency to support the establishment of an international nuclear fuel bank; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. DICKS):

H.R. 886. A bill to enhance ecosystem protection and the range of outdoor opportunities protected by statute in the Skykomish River valley of the State of Washington by designating certain lower-elevation Federal lands as wilderness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York (for herself and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio):

H.R. 887. A bill to provide for Project GRAD programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MEEKS of New York (for himself and Mr. FEENEY):

H.R. 888. A bill to provide for the admission to the United States of nonimmigrant business facilitation visitors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:

H.R. 889. A bill to amend the Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act of 1990 to establish vessel ballast water management requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. TIERNEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 890. A bill to establish requirements for lenders and institutions of higher education in order to protect students and other borrowers receiving educational loans; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MORAN of Virginia (for himself, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms.

SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SAXTON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. STARK, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. PLATTS, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. FILNER, Ms. LEE, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 891. A bill to ensure that domestic dog and cat fur is prohibited from being imported, exported, manufactured, sold, or advertised in the United States and to require the labeling of all fur products under the Fur Products Labeling Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 892. A bill to establish and provide for the treatment of Individual Development Accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POE:

H.R. 893. A bill to provide for loan repayment for prosecutors and public defenders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (for himself and Mr. CASTLE):

H.R. 894. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to apply certain requirements regarding the disclosure of identifying information within communications made through the Internet, to apply certain disclosure requirements to prerecorded telephone calls, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. REYNOLDS (for himself, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. KIRK, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. TERRY, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H.R. 895. A bill to take certain steps toward recognition by the United States of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin (for himself and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin):

H.R. 896. A bill to amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to provide for the pass through of all child support collected on behalf of families receiving assistance under the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. STARK, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. COHEN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HARE, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas):

H.R. 897. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense, Secretary of State, Secretary of the Interior, and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to provide to Congress copies and descriptions of contracts and task orders in excess of \$5,000,000 for work to be performed in Iraq and Afghanistan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period

to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ (for herself and Mr. RAMSTAD):

H.R. 898. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers to claim a work opportunity credit for hiring military service personnel returning from service in Iraq or Afghanistan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 899. A bill to provide a mechanism for the determination on the merits of the claims of claimants who met the class criteria in a civil action relating to racial discrimination by the Department of Agriculture but who were denied that determination; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SERRANO (for himself, Mr.

FORTUÑO, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HOYER, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PUTNAM, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. KIND, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. RENZI, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. DENT, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. WU, Mr. POE, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. MACK, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. KELLER, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. COBLE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. WELLER, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. McKEON, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. OLVER, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. MICA, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. WYNN, Mr. GILCREST, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CASTLE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, and Mr. CARDOZA):

H.R. 900. A bill to provide for a federally sanctioned self-determination process for the people of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. BIGGERT, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. KENNEDY):

H.R. 901. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to direct certain coeducational elementary and secondary schools to make available information on equality in school athletic programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself, Mr. EDWARDS, and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 902. A bill to facilitate the use for irrigation and other purposes of water produced in connection with development of energy resources; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

H.R. 903. A bill to provide for a study of options for protecting the open space characteristics of certain lands in and adjacent to the Arapaho and Roosevelt National Forests in Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. PERLMUTTER):

H.R. 904. A bill to better provide for compensation for certain persons injured in the course of employment at the Rocky Flats site in Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

H.R. 905. A bill to increase accountability and equity in the Federal budget; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina):

H.R. 906. A bill to promote and coordinate global change research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.J. Res. 23. A joint resolution proposing an amendment the Constitution of the United States relative to abolishing personal income, estate, and gift taxes and prohibiting the United States Government from engaging in business in competition with its citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H. Con. Res. 60. Concurrent resolution expressing support for the goals of Veterans Educate Today's Students (VETS) Day, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WELCH of Vermont

H. Res. 133. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 547) to facilitate the development of markets for alternative fuels and Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel fuel through research, development, and demonstration and data collection.

By Mr. CARNEY (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. DICKS, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas):

H. Res. 134. A resolution recognizing and honoring the employees of the Department of Homeland Security for their efforts and contributions to protect and secure the Nation; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. SCOTT of

Virginia, Ms. CARSON, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. SESTAK, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H. Res. 135. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a National Historically Black Colleges and Universities Week should be established; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York:

H. Res. 136. A resolution commending the Girl Scouts of the United States of America on the occasion of their 95th anniversary, for providing quality age-appropriate experiences that prepare girls to become the leaders of tomorrow and for raising issues important to girls; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. WEINER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HOLT, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H. Res. 137. A resolution honoring the life and six decades of public service of Jacob Birnbaum and especially his commitment freeing Soviet Jews from religious, cultural, and communal extinction; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROSS (for himself, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. BERRY, and Mr. BOOZMAN):

H. Res. 138. A resolution recognizing the importance of Hot Springs National Park on its 175th anniversary; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. LANTOS:

H.R. 907. A bill for the relief of Denes and Gyorgyi Fulop; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANTOS:

H.R. 908. A bill for the relief of Kuan-Wei Liang and Chun-Mei Hsu-Liang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 18: Ms. BEAN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CARSON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. DENT, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOYLE, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. HERSETH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. REYES, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 36: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 42: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 43: Mr. HARE.

H.R. 73: Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 89: Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 137: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 238: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 241: Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 269: Mr. SPRATT, Mr. REHBERG, and Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 303: Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 312: Mr. POE and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 314: Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 353: Mr. HALL of New York.

H.R. 358: Mr. SPRATT, Mr. SHULER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. WALSH of New York.

H.R. 365: Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. OBEY, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.

H.R. 370: Mr. WILSON of Ohio.

H.R. 411: Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mrs. BONO, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. PORTER, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. FOSSELLA, and Mr. SALI.

H.R. 450: Mr. REICHERT.

H.R. 455: Mr. STARK, Mr. HALL of New York, and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 491: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 511: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. HELLER, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. CANNON, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. REGULA, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. REHBERG, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

H.R. 566: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mr. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 583: Mr. GORDON and Mr. ETHERIDGE.

H.R. 584: Mr. FILNER and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 589: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. REICHERT.

H.R. 608: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. CUBIN, and Mrs. BONO.

H.R. 620: Mr. COHEN, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. SIREs, Ms. WATERS, and Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 634: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BAKER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. HOLT, Mr. ISSA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. KIND, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MCCOTTER, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. STUPAK, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 651: Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 652: Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 653: Ms. HIRONO and Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 656: Mr. KING of New York and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 663: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. HALL of New York.

H.R. 676: Mr. COHEN and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 677: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. REYES, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. SUTTON.

H.R. 678: Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 684: Mr. HARE.

H.R. 687: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 688: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. FOSSELLA.

H.R. 690: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 699: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 703: Ms. DeGETTE.

H.R. 710: Mr. WYNN, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. DeGETTE, and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 722: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 731: Mr. GERLACH and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 743: Mr. GILLMOR and Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 746: Mr. HALL of New York.

H.R. 748: Mr. PASTOR, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. SHIMKUS, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. LoBIONDO.

H.R. 753: Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. WAMP, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. COOPER, Mr. GORDON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. TANNER.

H.R. 757: Mr. McDERMOTT.

H.R. 759: Mr. KUHLE of New York and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 777: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 784: Mr. WOLF, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. FOX, Mr. McKEON, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. KIND, Ms. HERSETH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 811: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 822: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. McNULTY, and Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 845: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 846: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 851: Mr. PENCE.

H.R. 852: Mr. DICKS and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.J. Res. 16: Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.J. Res. 19: Mr. GOODE.

H. Con. Res. 37: Mr. GOODE.

H. Con. Res. 53: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H. Con. Res. 55: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H. Res. 53: Mr. WATT, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H. Res. 69: Mr. SHULER, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H. Res. 107: Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. NORWOOD, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MACK, and Mr. KING of Iowa.

H. Res. 113: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H. Res. 128: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mrs. CAPPS.

H. Res. 130: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BOSWELL, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. FATAH, Mr. BACA, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. CASTOR, Mr. SHULER, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. COHEN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CLAY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Ms. WATSON, Mr. TANNER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. MELANCON, and Ms. WATERS.

H. Res. 131: Mr. WELDON of Florida and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

## AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 547

OFFERED BY: MR. ROGERS OF MICHIGAN

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Redesignate section 6 as section 7 and insert after section 5 the following:

### SEC. 6. ENERGY SECURITY FUND AND ALTERNATIVE FUEL GRANT PROGRAM.

#### (A) ESTABLISHMENT OF FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Treasury a fund, to be known as the "Energy Security Fund" (referred to in this section as the "Fund"), consisting of—

(A) amounts transferred to the Fund under paragraph (2); and

(B) amounts credited to the Fund under paragraph (3)(C).

(2) TRANSFERS TO FUND.—For fiscal year 2008 and each fiscal year thereafter, the Secretary of the Treasury, subject to the availability of appropriations, shall transfer to the Fund an amount determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be equal to 50 percent of the total amount deposited in the general fund of the Treasury during the preceding fiscal year from fines, penalties, and other funds obtained through enforcement actions conducted pursuant to section 32912 of title 49, United States Code (including funds obtained under consent decrees).

#### (3) INVESTMENT OF AMOUNTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall invest in interest-bearing obligations of the United States such portion of the Fund as is not, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Treasury, required to meet current withdrawals.

(B) SALE OF OBLIGATIONS.—Any obligation acquired by the Fund may be sold by the Secretary of the Treasury at the market price.

(C) CREDITS TO FUND.—The interest on, and the proceeds from the sale or redemption of, any obligations held in the Fund shall be

credited to, and form a part of, the Fund in accordance with section 9602 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(4) USE OF AMOUNTS IN FUND.—Amounts in the Fund shall be made available to the Secretary of Energy, subject to the availability of appropriations, to carry out the grant program under subsection (b).

#### (b) ALTERNATIVE FUELS GRANT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy, acting through the Clean Cities Program of the Department of Energy, shall establish and carry out a program under which the Secretary shall provide grants to expand the availability to consumers of alternative fuels (as defined in section 32901(a) of title 49, United States Code).

#### (2) ELIGIBILITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), any entity that is eligible to receive assistance under the Clean Cities Program shall be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection.

#### (B) EXCEPTIONS.—

(i) CERTAIN OIL COMPANIES.—A large, vertically-integrated oil company shall not be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection.

(ii) PROHIBITION OF DUAL BENEFITS.—An entity that receives any other Federal funds for the construction or expansion of alternative refueling infrastructure shall not be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection for the construction or expansion of the same alternative refueling infrastructure.

(C) ENSURING COMPLIANCE.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy shall promulgate regulations to ensure that, before receiving a grant under this subsection, an eligible entity meets applicable standards relating to the installation, construction, and expansion of infrastructure necessary to increase the availability to consumers of alternative fuels (as defined in section 32901(a) of title 49, United States Code).

#### (3) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—

(A) GRANTS.—The amount of a grant provided under this subsection shall not exceed \$30,000.

(B) AMOUNT PER STATION.—An eligible entity shall receive not more than \$90,000 under this subsection for any station of the eligible entity during a fiscal year.

#### (4) USE OF FUNDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A grant provided under this subsection shall be used for the construction or expansion of alternative fueling infrastructure.

(B) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Not more than 3 percent of the amount of a grant provided under this subsection shall be used for administrative expenses.

H.R. 547

OFFERED BY: MR. BURGESS

AMENDMENT NO. 2: Page 4, line 17, strike "and".

Page 4, line 18, redesignate paragraph (3) as paragraph (4).

Page 4, after line 17, insert the following new paragraph:

(3) issues with respect to increased volatile emissions or increased nitrogen oxide emissions; and